

JOURNAL OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Walter Smyrniw: The Theme of Man-godhood in Oles Berdnyk's
Science Fiction

Орест Зілинський: Духова генеза українського відродження

Documenting the Ukrainian Nationalist Movements

Thomas M. Prymak: Mykhailo Hrushevsky: Populist or Statist?

Микола Мушинка: Чи є ікони?

Guide to Research

Book Reviews

10
SPRING 1981

ЖУРНАЛ
УКРАЇНОЗНАВЧИХ СТУДІЙ

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

University of Toronto

MARCO CARYNNYK
NADIA DIAKUN

VIVIAN OLENDER
ROMAN SENKUS, *Managing Editor*

FACULTY ADVISOR: Professor GEORGE S. N. LUCKYJ

EDITORIAL BOARD: J. Marko Bojcun, *York University* • Yury Boshyk, *University of Toronto* • Konstantin Huytan, *University of London* • Oleh Ilnytzkyj, *Harvard University* • Bohdan Krawchenko, *University of Alberta* • George Liber, *Columbia University* • Andrij Makuch, *University of Alberta* • Bohdan Mytrowytch, *Universite de Paris* • Professor Peter J. Potichnyj, *McMaster University* • Professor Ivan L. Rudnytsky, *University of Alberta* • Professor Orest H. T. Rudzik, *University of Toronto* • Professor Roman Serbyn, *Universite du Quebec a Montreal* • Myroslav Shkandrij, *University of Calgary* • Professor Danylo H. Struk, *University of Toronto*.

The *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (formerly *Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies*) is published semiannually, in the spring and fall, by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. Annual subscription rates are \$6.00 for individuals and \$8.00 for libraries and institutions. Cheques and money orders are payable in Canadian or American funds only to *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*. Please do not send cash. Subscribers outside Canada: please pay in U.S. funds.

The *Journal* publishes articles on Ukrainian-related subjects in the humanities and social sciences. The criterion for acceptance of submissions is their scholarly contribution to the field of Ukrainian studies. The *Journal* also publishes translations, documents, information, book reviews, letters and journalistic articles of a problem-oriented, controversial nature. Those wishing to submit manuscripts should observe the guidelines on the inside back cover.

Manuscripts, books for review, and all correspondence regarding subscriptions, changes of address, and editorial matters should be sent to: *Journal of Ukrainian Studies, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, M5S 1A1*.

© 1981 by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

Typesetting by Harmony Printing Limited, Toronto, Canada.

Printed by the University of Toronto Press.

ISSN 0228-1635

Articles

Walter Smyrniew: The Theme of Man-godhood in Oles Berdnyk's Science Fiction	3
Орест Зілинський: Духова генеза українського відродження	20
Documenting the Ukrainian Nationalist Movements	42

Review Articles

Thomas M. Prymak: Mykhailo Hrushevsky: Populist or Statist?	65
Микола Мушинка: Чи є ікони: словацькі, карпатські, костельні чи українські?	79

Guide to Research

The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace: Its Significance for Ukrainian Studies (Lubomyr Y. Luciuk)	90
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Reviews

Wladyslaw A. Serczyk. <i>Historia Ukrainy</i> (Roman Szporluk)	99
Pamphil D. Jurkevych. <i>Tvory</i> (Taras D. Zakydalsky)	102
Mahdalyna Laslo-Kutsiuk. <i>Velyka tradytsiia: Ukrainska klasychna literatura v porivnialnomu vysvitlenni</i> (Larissa M. L. Zaleska Onyshkevych)	104
Bohdan Wytywicky. <i>The Other Holocaust</i> (Raul Hilberg) ..	107
Ulas Samchuk. <i>Slidamy pioneriv: Epos ukrainskoi Ameryky</i> (Ihor V. Zielyk)	108
David J. Carter. <i>Behind Canadian Barbed Wire: Alien, Refugee and Prisoner of War Camps in Canada 1914-1946</i> (Lubomyr Y. Luciuk)	112
Roman Rakhmanny. <i>In Defense of the Ukrainian Cause</i> (Yarema Gregory Kelebay)	115
Stephan M. Horak, comp. <i>Russia, the USSR, and Eastern Europe: A Bibliographic Guide to English Language Publications, 1964-1974</i> (Yury Boshyk)	118
Books Received	120

Journal

Contributors

LUBOMYR LUCIUK is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, working on the migration of Ukrainians to Canada after World War Two.

MYKOLA MUSHYNKA is a folklorist and a scholar of Ukrainian literature and culture living in Czechoslovakia.

THOMAS PRYMAK is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Toronto working on a biography of Mykhailo Hrushevsky.

WALTER SMYRNIW is an associate professor of Russian and Ukrainian language and literature at McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada.

Walter Smyrniw

THE THEME OF MAN-GODHOOD IN OLES BERDNYK'S SCIENCE FICTION

Ваша теза про бессмерття Людини в плоті — богохульство! Ви ставите під сумнів існування душі, боготворите Людину!

Чи не краще самими стати Богами..., ніж чекати милості невідомого Бога? Перед людством — прекрасний шлях!

“Поза часом і простором”

Two major tendencies have evolved in the science-fiction genre since the nineteenth century. One entails an emphasis on the developments in science and technology, and the other, an accentuation of the physical and psychological evolution of man or other life forms in advanced technological environments. After the appearance of Mary Shelley's notorious *Frankenstein* (1818), due attention was paid in Western science fiction both to the marvels of scientific and technical progress and to the various consequences that it could have on living beings and their societies. This trend can be observed in the science-fiction stories of Edgar Allan Poe, in the scientific romances of Jules Verne, in the most diverse and imaginative science-fiction works of Herbert George Wells and also in the writings of both major and minor science-fiction authors of the twentieth century.

Ukrainian science fiction underwent a somewhat different course of development. Since its beginning in the 1920s, Ukrainian science fiction was under the hegemony of science and technology till the early 1960s. The foremost representative of this trend was Volodymyr Vladko, who is hailed as the Dean of Ukrainian science fiction by Soviet critics. Vladko's preoccupation with developments in science and technology can be discerned from the very titles of his works: “Raketoplan S-218” (Rocketplane S-218), “Chudesnyi henerator” (A Marvelous Generator), “Blyskavka v poloni” (The Captured Lightning Bolt) and *Idut robotari* (The Robots are Coming). Vladko not only wrote a number of such

stories and novels during the 1930's, but revised them during the next two decades in order to update them with new developments in science. Vladko was very concerned about the scientific accuracy in his writings, but he paid very little attention to psychological verisimilitude. Consequently, for several decades the actions of the robots in Vladko's science fiction were much more credible than the behavior of human personages.

During the 1960s, Vladko finally realized the psychological inadequacies in his writings and endeavoured to rectify them. His efforts to develop various human problems were, however, much too meagre and came too late, for in the 1960s Vladko's writings were eclipsed by the science fiction of Oles Berdnyk.

A prolific and a much more talented writer than Vladko, Berdnyk did not abandon the scientific and technological notions. On the contrary, in his stories and novels he introduced a greater diversity of scientific concepts than any previous Ukrainian author. But unlike Vladko, Berdnyk succeeded in depicting the actual and the hypothetical achievements in science and technology in relation to various problems of human existence. Moreover, Berdnyk explored further the notion of evolution in respect to individual beings and societies than any previous Ukrainian science-fiction writers.

In this endeavour Berdnyk achieved his greatest success in his most accomplished novel *Zorianyi korsar* (The Star Corsair, 1971). He describes there a somewhat unusual assignment which is given to a Universal Robot during a flight to another galaxy. As the crew of the starship perishes from an unexpected exposure to radiation, a dying mother orders one of the robots to take care of her infants. This is an extraordinary task, even for a Universal Robot. In order to look after the newborn twins, who had been protected during the accident by the special radiation shields of their nursery, the navigational robot had to modify his own program substantially. To carry out the assignment, the robot first of all had to reconstruct his own body to gain the means of mobility (being a navigational robot, he was bolted to the floor). And thereafter he had to assume the role of a nurse and learn quickly how to feed the infants, change their diapers and even caress them. Later the robot became a teacher and provided the twins with a thorough education not merely in science and technology, but in arts and humanities as well. And eventually the Universal Robot, whom the boys called affectionately Urchyk, became a companion of the adult explorers of space who established contacts with various forms of life in another galaxy.

By way of this episode Berdnyk presents simultaneously the

stages of growth of the human twins and the various stages of development of the mechanical companion. In order to fulfill the different roles, the robot not merely acquired new programs by obtaining diverse information from the memory banks of the starship, but also learned how to use the knowledge in solving many unpredictable problems that arose during the rearing of infants in outer space. Inevitably the learning process enabled the robot to think independently and not merely to solve practical problems, but to engage in philosophical speculations, even about such a complex and puzzling phenomenon as love. But the development of the Universal Robot is not confined to the expansion of mechanical intelligence. His body also underwent several complex changes. The robot realized that his cold, metallic body frightened and repelled the children. Hence he manufactured for himself a new body which was mechanical in nature, but nevertheless had the appearance, the soft texture and the temperature of a normal human body. Eventually the robot wanted to acquire a real human body so that he would be able to experience not only the rational, but also the emotional substance of love. The twins helped him to realise this by producing for him a chemical humanoid body into which they transferred the memories and the intelligence of their former mechanical friend.

At this point the reader is left wondering whether the love affair of the former robot would culminate in a consummated marriage and whether he would become the father of new descendants. Whereas the progenitive abilities of the Universal Robot are not illustrated, there is no doubt whatsoever about the fact that by way of this witty episode the author endeavoured to outline the possibility of a self-directed robotic evolution.

For avid readers of science fiction it is not difficult to discern that, like many other writers in this genre, Berdnyk resorts to depictions of robots in order to raise certain questions about human existence. The portrayal of robotic metamorphosis in *Zorianyi korsar* is, of course, relevant to man's own evolution. If advances in science facilitate the creation of a mechanical entity that can evolve into a humanoid being, would it be possible to alter the evolution of man or other biological beings with the aid of an advanced knowledge of genetic engineering? If this were possible, how should the scientifically directed evolution be realized, and what should be the ultimate goal of this evolution? Berdnyk entertains these notions not only in *Zorianyi korsar*, but also in a number of his previous science-fiction works.

The first three books published by Oles Berdnyk between 1957 and 1959 were in the main devoted to various science-fiction

Journal

adventure tales.¹ Some of them were quite entertaining, but devoid of depictions of complex technology or of bold ideas about the future way of life. A noteworthy exception is Berdnyk's story "Poza chasom i prostorom" (Beyond Time and Space, 1957). Although briefly, the author outlines therein both the necessary technology to build a starship that would travel to another solar system faster than the speed of light and the possible evolution of man into a godlike being. Henceforth these notions recurred quite regularly in Berdnyk's subsequent works, mainly in his novels which were more suitable for detailed postulations of technical and evolutionary developments among living beings.

Shliakhy tytaniv (The Ways of the Titans, 1959), Berdnyk's first major novel, contains an enthusiastic acclaim of scientific and technological progress. This novel offers vast pleasures for the science-fiction devotees who are fond of sophisticated space technology. Such notions as matter-antimatter propulsion systems, an entire planet made up of antimatter with the necessary technology to prevent a starship from exploding on landing on this planet, various antigravity devices and gravitational propulsion modules, the production of a vast number of indestructible war machines that are capable of annihilating all life forms in an entire galaxy and are controlled by the will of a single scientist—all of this may impress and entertain the readers of this novel. But the above-mentioned developments are quite rudimentary in comparison to the achievements outlined in the concluding part of the work. There Berdnyk describes how the various advancements in science made it possible to achieve immortality and even "resurrection" of the dead (providing the body of the deceased had not decomposed). An equally impressive technological innovation was the "neutralization of space," which made it possible for starships to travel in a few seconds to another solar system, situated some 10,000 parsecs from earth.²

The descriptions of the real and imagined scientific developments in *Shliakhy tytaniv* are so detailed that the author deemed it necessary to elucidate the scientific terminology in footnotes. From these descriptions it is quite plain that Berdnyk endorses the notion of scientific and technological progress, but with certain

¹ *Poza chasom i prostorom: fantastichni povisti ta opovidannia* (Kiev, 1957); *Liudyna bez sertsia: fantastichno-pryhodnytska povist* (Kiev, 1958); *Pryvyd ide po zemli: naukovo-fantastichna povist* (Kiev, 1959).

² A parsec is a unit equalling 3.26 light years that is used to measure interstellar space; the speed of light is 300,000 km. per second.

reservations. In a chapter entitled "Tsarstvo zaliznoho dyktatora" (The Kingdom of the Iron Dictator) Berdnyk advocates that advancements in computer technology must not reach such a point that all thinking processes are passed on to the machines, because this can lead to a situation where an electronic machine will become an absolute dictator over humanoid life forms. Human development, maintains Berdnyk, must keep pace with all technical innovations. Hence he outlines in the novel how wisely and well the men of the future utilize the scientific discoveries for the welfare of all living creatures. Their achievements are certainly impressive, especially the process that can rejuvenate all the cells of one's body and thus provide perfect health and virtual immortality. But there are certain limitations in the sphere of biological development. Even when the *Homo sapiens* has learned how to take perfect care of his body, even in the distant future he will require food in order to survive. The only significant progress in this sphere was a change in eating habits. The men of the future stopped eating the flesh of dead animals and derived their sustenance from vegetables and synthetic foods. The dependence on food was modified somewhat, but certainly not eliminated. Consequently, man still appears as a finite being in the highly advanced technical society.

In his next novel, *Strila chasu* (The Arrow of Time, 1960), Berdnyk dwells once again on the problem of biological limitations in the context of advanced science and technology. A young student, Vasyl Horovy, is fully convinced about the endless progress in science. Confidently and even arrogantly he states: "Isn't man discovering more and more secrets in nature? And knowledge has no end! Hence mankind is as omniscient as God, for there is no secret that we will not be able to unravel some day."³ Horovy also believes in an unlimited evolution of man himself and that this eventually will transform the *Homo sapiens* to such an extent that he will become a godlike being. A journey to a highly advanced alien civilization quickly invalidates these presumptuous notions. When Horovy reaches a strange planet, he is both dazzled by the marvels of a highly advanced science and technology and astounded on being told by the alien host that biological evolutions do not continue indefinitely. The alien illustrates this by an analogy to human development: "No vessel can be filled continuously. To an extent man is also a vessel. He represents the highest branch in the evolution of the animal world. But all branches must develop

³ Oles Berdnyk, *Strila chasu* (Kiev, 1960), p. 36.

according to the laws of nature. Are you familiar with biological dead ends? They confirm the stagnancy prevailing in matter. In any world man will come inevitably to a biological dead end, as had formerly all his non-intelligent predecessors and ancestors."⁴

Horovy learns how the alien civilization coped with the problem of overcoming a dead end in its evolution. These beings became aware that further development would be impossible as long as they had to derive nourishment from various food chains. They searched for a radical means to free themselves from this dependence, and after a century-long effort they found out how to obtain their energy not from plant- or animal-based foods, but directly from their sun. These living beings were able to exist on solar energy because their scientists produced a device that was implanted into their bodies and thus transformed the energy of the sun directly into biologically useful energy. This led to many changes and rapid developments in the realm of knowledge and their mode of life. But even this extraordinary escape from an evolutionary dead end did not result in immortality, omniscience and omnipotence, the minimum prerequisites for godhood. During his second visit to this galaxy, Horovy discovered that even these highly advanced beings were unable to escape death and to avert an unexpected catastrophe from outer space.

Through further development of the plot, Berdnyk shows in *Strila chasu* how the various advancements in science enabled mankind to conquer space and even to travel through time in order to contact intelligent beings in distant galaxies. But even with the aid of highly advanced science and technology, man is still unable to control all developments in space. Therefore, when the sun of our solar system began to die, even the advanced future Homo sapiens did not have the knowledge nor the power to replenish its energy. In order to prolong life on Earth, the planet had to be moved to another solar system. By way of these episodes the author points out how unfounded and near-sighted were the conjectures about the omniscience and omnipotence of science that had been made by such twentieth-century proponents of scientific progress as Vasyl Horovy.

With greater boldness and imagination than previous Ukrainian science-fiction writers, Oles Berdnyk postulated in his first two novels a number of complex and intriguing problems in regard to the question of ultimate developments in biology and technology. His third major work, *Dity bezmezhzhia* (The Children of

⁴ Ibid., p. 81.

Infinity, 1964), is certainly no less daring and no less imaginative than his previous novels. In contrast to his preceding writings, the various technological gadgets and developments recede, however, into the background. Instead the author places the emphasis on philosophical questions and on man's psychological potentials. In the very beginning of *Dity bezmezhzhia*, Berdnyk discounts the notion that there was a creator of the universe. The reader is assured that "no one has created either matter or life. It has always existed in the realm of infinity. More than that—it comprises the essence of the universe. It's impossible to speak of the universe, of an existence without matter. If matter did not exist, there would be no universe either. What has a creator to do with all of this?"⁵

The adherents of materialistic philosophy would no doubt be appeased by the above statements, but their comfort would be short-lived. They would be very disheartened on encountering in Berdnyk's novel statements to the effect that in the future the major developments will not entail a technological evolution, but primarily an internal, a psychological development of man,⁶ and therefore "where one can do without cumbersome technology, it must be abandoned."⁷ Throughout the novel the author seeks to demonstrate the "enormous" strength of man's "psychic energy" and asserts that "when mankind will be able to gain complete control over this flow of energy, it will become almighty."⁸ Berdnyk outlines a major breakthrough in the experimentation with man's psychic potential. With the aid of a device called the "cerebro-psychic concentrator," some individuals learn how to transmit their psychic impulses through space, and eventually they even manage to create a "psychic double" of themselves that they can project to other places. The objectives and the advantages of this development are most apparent. By being able to transmit one's "psychic double" instantly to any point in space, the traveller would be able to penetrate into all hostile environments of space, including the centre of our sun, which, incidentally, is visited by two of the brave psychic travellers of the novel. As these psychic transmissions are instantaneous, the enormous intergalactic distances and the very infinity of space would no longer be obstacles to the psychic space traveller. And the dire problem of relativity,

⁵ Oles Berdnyk, *Dity bezmezhzhia* (Kiev, 1964), p. 16.

⁶ Ibid., p. 92.

⁷ Ibid., p. 220.

⁸ Ibid., p. 121.

which prevents one from returning to one's own time period after a very lengthy journey through space, would also be solved.

Whereas it is not difficult to discern that the ultimate purpose of man's psychic evolution in *Dity bezmezhzhia* entails the final conquest of space and time, it seems hardly possible to grasp the laws and the modus operandi of this development. Indeed, this novel contains many notions that, shrouded by mysticism, seem as nebulous and incomprehensible as the distant stellar systems of the Milky Way. In spite of this, it is possible to surmise, especially from the epilogue of the work, that Berdnyk endeavoured not merely to postulate how the power of the human mind could lead to a further stage in the evolution of the *Homo sapiens*, but also to depict such notions as "transmutation" of the human body and "transfer of consciousness," which would in turn facilitate travels "to other stars without rockets" and the "penetration of other dimensions."⁹ Moreover, after *Dity bezmezhzhia* the notions pertaining to the infinite power of the human mind became the focal point of Berdnyk's writings.

On reading Berdnyk's works in a chronological order, one inevitably not merely becomes aware of his consistent preoccupation with the notions pertaining to the actual and the hypothetical developments in science, technology and life itself, but also notes his serious concern about the ultimate results and the final consequences of scientific and evolutionary processes. In view of this, it is not surprising that the very word "teleology" appears in a number of his works. Therefore it is quite consequential that Berdnyk chose to utilize the teleological premise in *Zorianyi korsar* to depict and to assess the consequences of scientific and biological developments. And on reading Berdnyk's most accomplished work, one cannot avoid being delighted by the fact that the author presents a more detailed and a much more lucid account of these developments.

In *Zorianyi korsar*, Berdnyk is very sceptical about the contribution of conventional science and technology to evolutionary developments. He manifests this attitude in the depiction of life on the planet Aoda. There the scientists discovered the secret of photosynthesis, and this led to the production of synthetic foods and other necessities. Automated factories made work quite unnecessary, and all the material needs were provided for the entire population of the planet. But this did not further evolutionary developments. On the contrary, by providing unlimited affluence,

⁹ Ibid., p. 352.

science and technology deprived the population of the need and the desire to struggle and to progress. Moreover, the discovery fostered a purely hedonistic existence and a vegetative apathy. Consequently, "evolution came to an anti-evolutionary dead end; it was in a state of a rotary degradation," and in a few centuries "an involution began. The majority of the people were already unable to speak."¹⁰

Berdnyk refrains from emphasizing that scientific progress must lead inevitably to retrogressive and involutionary developments. On the contrary, he describes in *Zorianyi korsar* how science gave rise to an alternative development on the planetary system of Ara. The members of this civilization managed to avoid the paralyzing hedonistic decadence that prevailed on Aoda. The people of Ara developed their science and technology to such an extent that no further progress was possible. They achieved not only immortality, but also the means to resurrect the dead. But at the height of its development, this civilization also faced a major crisis. Since no further advancement was possible in life or science, an increasing number of people lost their desire to live and committed suicide. The government, obviously, did not tolerate such actions, and the authorities brought the suicidal maniacs back to life. Nevertheless, the mass suicides led to a dilemma that brought Ara to a state of psychological decline and involution. The scientists of Ara were called to a Congress in order to solve the crisis. But the best they were able to offer was to explode their star system in order to restore an evolutionary cycle in the cosmos. These scientists concluded that death is an essential part of an evolutionary cycle, and that by overcoming personal death they merely postponed the ultimate death of their species.

In *Zorianyi korsar* the evolutionary dilemma is solved not by an ingenious scientist, but by a dissident in the field of science. The discoverer of the new evolutionary approach was the humanoid Aeras, a former teacher of physics on a planet similar to Earth. Aeras examined various scientific and philosophical theories of evolution and found them all unsatisfactory. Next he explored the mystical and occult sciences and dismissed them as absurd. Then Aeras realized that inasmuch as he represents the highest point of evolution among life forms, he must examine himself in order to comprehend the evolutionary phenomenon, for, as he put it, "I am the focal point of knowledge."¹¹ Through further

¹⁰ Oles Berdnyk, *Zorianyi korsar* (Kiev, 1971), p. 99.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 228.

Journal

introspection Aeras realized that his ultimate desire was to become omniscient and almighty. He knew, however, that he could not achieve this goal in his present biological form and concluded: "It is essential to disrupt the despotism of the form that was imposed on us by nature."¹² When he attempted to teach his students about the need to become almighty and omniscient, Aeras was obviously declared insane. Fortunately, he was placed in an asylum. The environment of this institution enabled him to refine his theories and to test them through experiments.

During his confinement, Aeras reflected on the laws that pertain to evolutionary developments. On considering the food chains without which many living beings could not survive, he concluded that the dependence on food amounts to a form of bondage. "Why is it necessary to eat someone in order to stay alive?" he queried.¹³ Aeras resolved to discover whether it would be possible to exist without eating. He started to eat less and less, and at times refrained from eating for several days. At first he lost much weight, but eventually broke the habit of eating and "began a conscious assimilation of air, water and sunlight."¹⁴ The conversion to a solar form of energy was a success, and Aeras was able to determine henceforth his own evolution. Eventually he changed into a being that could derive its energy from any source, overcome gravity, and travel not only through space, but even through solid objects. In short, Aeras deviated from the evolutionary pattern of his species by way of a self-directed and self-willed metamorphosis into a demiurge, or man-god.

By freeing himself from the laws of nature, Aeras was able to escape from the asylum. Prior to leaving he recruited a group of disciples who also wanted to attain the state of man-godhood. When the disciples completed their metamorphosis into godhood, they were not content to exist in isolation. As one of them phrased it, "we did not undertake the most difficult trial for our own sake. We wanted to bring our planet to a new path of evolution."¹⁵

The government on Aeras's native planet, Orana, was opposed to such evolutionary changes and stigmatized Aeras and his followers as a gang of pirates. The legal and political establishment was, however, most unsuccessful in persecuting them, for these new beings were, after all, almighty. But in spite of being invincible, the godlike beings did not use force or coercion in their

¹² Ibid., p. 229.

¹³ Ibid., p. 232.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 233.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 241.

missionary activities. They adhered to a code that ensured complete freedom for all. Soon the godhood mission spread from planet to planet and to various galaxies. The most zealous missionary was the first disciple of Aeras, who became known as the Star Corsair. He travelled not only through space, but through time as well. Eventually he reached Earth and proclaimed the beginning of the godhood era for mankind.

Inasmuch as *Zorianyi korsar* ends with this proclamation one cannot be certain whether the author considered the Homo sapiens as a worthy candidate for godhood. One could doubt whether humans were sufficiently advanced to undergo a metamorphosis into gods. But Berdnyk outlined this possibility in a work that he evidently wrote prior to *Zorianyi korsar*. Entitled “*Apostol bezsmertia*” (The Apostle of Immortality, 1970), the story apparently circulated widely among Soviet Ukrainian readers in *samvydav* versions before being published in the West in 1975.¹⁶

The central character of *Apostol bezsmertia* is a young Ukrainian mathematician called Hryhorii. He had been a computer specialist, but had to leave the profession due to an accident that left him paralyzed. While confined to bed, Hryhorii began a hunger therapy when other medical remedies failed. As the therapy brought an unexpected and complete recovery, Hryhorii decided to subject himself to an experiment in order to determine whether it would be possible to alter his whole physiology. Withdrawing to the Carpathian Mountains, he began a sixty day-long fast and strained his mind and will-power to the utmost in order to force his body to assimilate nourishment directly from the sun. The end result of this undertaking was a metamorphosis into a new being. Direct utilization of solar energy eventually made him immortal and omnipotent. But he had no desire to be the sole possessor of infinite power and supreme knowledge. Eager to teach others how to attain it, the new man-god met a traveller in the Caucasus and told him how godhood may be achieved. This man-god achieved some success in his apostleship. His first convert became Valia, his former girlfriend. Equal rights are evidently guaranteed in the realm of godhood.

What inferences can be made from the man-godhood theme in Berdnyk's works? Does it indicate that the author is given to depictions of pure fantasy? Is it based on a scientific premise, or is one justified in stating, as Soviet critics frequently had, that mysticism and magic are a dominant feature of Berdnyk's writings?

¹⁶ Oles Berdnyk, *Zoloti vorota: povisti* (Baltimore, 1975).

Till recent times Berdnyk's portrayal of the metamorphosis leading to mangodhood would surely have been regarded as sheer fantasy. Evolutionary processes were conceived as very stable and subject to their own laws, which could not be manipulated by man. But the most recent developments in genetics, which include not only the isolation of the DNA molecule and the synthesis of a man-made DNA molecule, but also direct intrusions into evolutionary processes by an asexual transfer of genetic material from one cell to another that can then result in the creation of new species of living organisms, make genetic engineering and controlled evolutionary development a real possibility. Moreover, geneticists have isolated recently the human chromosomes that are apparently related to genetic memory. The discovery of the mechanism that would activate this memory pattern could lead to many interesting possibilities, among them the precise recollection of the various evolutionary stages of the *Homo sapiens*.

These developments in genetics certainly provide a scientific base for Berdnyk's exposition of the man-godhood theme. What is more, Berdnyk is evidently well aware of the recent discoveries in life sciences. In *Zorianyi korsar*, he makes several allusions to genetic memory and offers certain conjectures about the means to activate this memory. Furthermore, Berdnyk advocates in this novel that the evolutionary advancements for all living species involved radical departures from the preceding forms and the previous environment: "Even the lower animals were not afraid to break the law of statics. Fish desired to go out on dry land and were born as amphibious creatures. Their timid relatives are still in the oceans. The lizards wanted to fly, and a multitude of charming creatures—birds—began to soar above the planet. The primeval savage primates raised their heads to the stars—and became humans!"¹⁷ Berdnyk maintains that inasmuch as the non-intelligent creatures took the necessary steps in a transition to a higher form, as a conscious creature man could use his intellect and will-power to elevate himself to a higher sphere of existence by stimulating his genetic memory to recall the previous adaptation procedures and then use this knowledge to transform the human body. Berdnyk even postulates an explanation at the molecular level of the metamorphosis of man into a being capable of directly utilizing solar energy. He states that "our cells and organs have magnetic fields. They have varying intensities, different directions, different beams and polarities," but on learning how to "con-

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 230.

centrate the energies of all the organs and cells into a single complex" man could transmute the cells of his body into a receptor of solar energy.¹⁸

Berdnyk's treatment of the evolutionary notions that could culminate in man-godhood has certainly a bearing on the recent developments in life sciences and technological trends—the current research in solar energy is as well known as our pending energy crisis. Berdnyk's incorporation of these notions into science fiction is indeed very imaginative and thought-provoking. After all, if new discoveries in genetics may enable man to intrude into the evolutionary dynamics and to employ genetic engineering in order to eradicate such problems as genetically inherited diseases, to breed better animals and to raise more crops, would it not be logical for him to attempt to shape his own evolution? And if man were to possess the means to accomplish this, why should he not endeavor to attain omnipotence, immortality and an absolute state of freedom, which thus far was enjoyed only by various deities?

Berdnyk's treatment of the man-godhood theme certainly lies within the realm of scientific probability—and the exploration of various probabilities based on scientific data constitutes the very nature of science fiction. While Berdnyk dwelled on the theme of man-godhood in his novels, stories and even poems, his writings were in the main entertaining and thought-provoking. But in the works published after *Zorianyi korsar* it appeared as though Berdnyk had forgotten that science fiction is based mainly on depictions of scientific probabilities rather than on the portrayal of concrete reality. His subsequent writings began to contain not merely hypothetical and fictional expositions of the man-godhood theme, but pronouncements for a program of actual developments that could lead to an evolution of man into a godlike being. In his essays and letters, Berdnyk began to expound an entire system of man-godhood mythology. These works are imbued with such didactic utterings as "There is but one value for which it is worthwhile to struggle and to face death: *our divine essence*."¹⁹ Berdnyk aimed such slogans not only at his countrymen, but also at all of humanity. In one of his epistles to the people of Earth, Berdnyk declares: "Cosmic Ukraine makes a brotherly appeal to mankind—to begin a New State of Divine Life to which Christ, the Great

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 235.

¹⁹ Oles Berdnyk, *Ukraina sichi vohnianoi* (Baltimore, 1977), p. 19. Berdnyk's italics.

Teacher of the New Testament, called us in his prayer.”²⁰ On reading many similar appeals, one cannot help but wonder whether Berdnyk is suffering from an apostolic delusion.

There are many things one does not and, indeed, cannot know about the biographies of contemporary writers. But it is a well-documented fact that Oles Berdnyk had written and published seventeen science-fiction novels and a host of short stories prior to being expelled from the Writers' Union in 1973. The theme of man-godhood recurred in a number of his works, but until 1973 Berdnyk presented it with skill, great imagination and even gentle humor. It was not put to the reader didactically and in categorical imperatives as it is in his later essays and letters. As the didactic declarations were published after Berdnyk's expulsion from the Writers' Union and were all printed abroad, often without the consent of the author, one could suspect that either these works may have been written by someone else, or that the harassment and incarceration that Berdnyk faced frequently in the 1970s had a profound effect on his writings and perhaps even on his mental faculties. Subsequent data may, of course, shed more light on the matter, but even at present there is some evidence about Berdnyk's transition from the writing of science fiction to didactic epistles and essays.

On the basis of the attacks on Berdnyk in the Soviet press, one gets the impression that the author started to advocate the need to strive towards man-godhood only after the publication of *Zorianyi korsar*. For example, on 21 April 1972, O. Mykytan censured Berdnyk in *Literaturna Ukraina* for assuming the “role of a preacher” and for propagating various notions about godhood and incorporeal existence. A close examination of pertinent data confirms, however, that Berdnyk began to manifest such tendencies much earlier. Evidently, Soviet literary gendarmes did not become aware of Berdnyk's preaching tendencies until he became a popular public speaker on science fiction, especially at gatherings of university students. But from the very beginning of his literary career, Berdnyk took every opportunity to address his readers directly in the prefaces and afterwords of his major works. In the foreword to *Shliakhy tytaniv*, for example, Berdnyk urges the reader to believe “that Man will become immortal, omnipotent, omnipresent . . . ”²¹ Moreover, the style and the tone of these prefaces is very similar to Berdnyk's subsequent didactic essays and epistles.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 32. Berdnyk's capitalization.

²¹ Oles Berdnyk, *Shliakhy tytaniv* (Kiev, 1959), p. 11. Berdnyk's capitalization.

Literary and political authorities evidently failed to notice that Berdnyk used the prefaces as the means to preach to the readers, to plead that they believe that the fiction of his novels will ultimately become a reality of life. From this it follows that throughout the course of his literary career, Berdnyk was persistently preoccupied with the formulation of a mythological system about man-godhood. His essays and letters merely confirm an eagerness to create a religious cult based on a science-fiction premise. Berdnyk not only established this cult, but became its first convert and its first preacher. Obviously, the Soviet authorities could not tolerate this science-fiction creed. It presented a greater threat than the traditional and established religions and provided a serious competition to the sanctioned Marxist-Leninist doctrine, which, incidentally, is also based on a pseudo-scientific premise in respect to man's evolution by way of dialectical materialism. The Marxist-Leninist cult assures the believers of an eventual paradise on earth, but it does not promise them either eternal life or omnipotence.

The official Soviet campaign against Berdnyk's cult of man-godhood was intense, harsh and obviously devastating, but it was never waged directly or explicitly. It was in the main camouflaged by euphemisms, clichés and innuendos. *Literaturna Ukraina* declared that Berdnyk's "preachings are filled with Biblical, Buddhist and Yogic dogmas, as well as the maxims of various charlatans . . .,"²² and later this very paper announced that for some time Berdnyk has been "actively supporting his creative work with public activities, appearing before his readers with dubious, extremely confused pseudo-philosophical maxims."²³ On the pages of *Radianska Ukraina*, Iu. Malanchuk censured Berdnyk for his failure to show how "only communism and the new social order . . . will lead to genuine unity among men" and went on to denounce the author's portrayal of "the demiurges of the new worlds."²⁴ Equally vague and ambiguous about Berdnyk's real activities was the announcement of 15 May 1973 in *Literaturna Ukraina* that the Executive Board of the Ukrainian Writers' Union approved the expulsion of Oles Berdnyk from this Union "for his antisocial acts and deviations from the principles and tasks outlined in the charter of the USSR Writers' Union."²⁵

²² O. Mykytan, "U roli propovidnyka," *Literaturna Ukraina*, 21 April 1972.

²³ *Literaturna Ukraina*, 27 March 1973.

²⁴ *Radianska Ukraina*, 15 May 1973.

²⁵ *Literaturna Ukraina*, 15 May 1973.

From the above-cited examples of the rather obscure ideological rhetoric, it is obvious that all notions pertaining to the cult of man-godhood are regarded in the Soviet domain as both heretical and antisocial activities. And this is the main, and perhaps the foremost, reason for the persecution of Oles Berdnyk in the early 1970s, for the very harassment of the author prior to his notorious letters to every important person on Earth and prior to his involvement with the Ukrainian Helsinki Group.

Berdnyk's cult of man-godhood is quite incompatible with the official Soviet ideology. However, it is equally unpalatable to the members of major world religions. Most likely they would be irked and provoked by the numerous parodies, by the unreserved ridicule of all who believe in a Supreme Power, which recur as leitmotifs in most of Berdnyk's renditions of the man-godhood theme. A passage in *Zorianyi korsar*, entitled "Sud nad bohamy" (The Trial of the Gods), would no doubt displease all who worship a deity.²⁶ And devout Christians would inevitably be offended by the depiction of the Star Corsair, who appears in the novel as a new saviour, introduces new commandments and bestows on mankind a sacred chalice containing "the wine of immortality."²⁷

The recurring antitheistic assertions in Berdnyk's novels, stories and essays completely invalidate the conjecture about Berdnyk's religious belief that was made recently by Ivan Hrynnokh: "Who is Oles Berdnyk? He is an utopian who, on gazing at the Transfiguration of Christ on Mount Tabor, was transfigured himself and endowed with charisma, and he became God's fool for the sake of Christ."²⁸ Devoid of substance, this conclusion does not stem from Hrynnokh's misreading of Berdnyk's works. It is apparent from the article that he completely ignored Berdnyk's science-fiction writings and derived the above notions from Berdnyk's essays and letters, particularly from Berdnyk's letter to Pope John Paul II.²⁹ To be sure, Berdnyk is experiencing at present the extreme cruelty and servitude that prevails in Soviet penal

²⁶ Berdnyk, *Zorianyi korsar*, pp. 271-8.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 373.

²⁸ Ivan Hrynnokh, "Oles Berdnyk (utopist chy kharyzmatyk na obrii druhoho tysiacholittia khristyianstva v Ukraini?)," *Suchasnist*, April 1980, p. 99.

²⁹ Hrynnokh is evidently not well acquainted with Berdnyk's science fiction; this is attested to not merely by the numerous inaccuracies in his brief bibliography of Berdnyk's science fiction, but also by his erroneous reference to Berdnyk's novel, which he calls "Zorianyi kosmos." Ibid., pp. 88-9.

camps; but he is not punished there for his belief in Christ or in the Almighty. It is quite plain from Berdnyk's writings that the cult of man-godhood, which he and his few followers have designated recently as "The Brotherhood of an Alternative Evolution," has nothing in common with the Christian creed. Berdnyk should not be hailed, therefore, "as the whip of God, as a fearless prophet."³⁰

Berdnyk's cult of man-godhood, which emerged from a theme in his science-fiction writings, is certainly unprecedented in the history of Ukrainian literature or, for that matter, in the literary developments of the Soviet Union. Many Soviet science-fiction writers have composed works that do entail a number of deviations from the accepted periphery of the science-fiction genre. But no other Soviet author has dared to dwell on a theme to such an extent that it evolved as a mythological system and, furthermore, to promote it publicly as a religious cult.

Berdnyk's involvement with the cult of man-godhood is, of course, unique in the Soviet Union. But in terms of international developments in science fiction, Berdnyk's obsession with the mangodhood theme and cult is neither unusual nor unprecedented. Many Western science-fiction authors have embraced this theme in their works, especially during the recent decades. Moreover, Berdnyk's endeavors to establish a cult based on notions formulated in science fiction were preceded by Ron Hubbard, a former American writer. Hubbard was at first active as a science-fiction author, but decided that greater profits could be derived from religious activities and, therefore, in 1954 launched his science-fiction cult, erroneously called the "Church of Scientology." It has been estimated that the scientology cult has at present about four million followers throughout the world. But, obviously, it has none in the Soviet Union.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 90.

Орест Зілинський

ДУХОВА ГЕНЕЗА ПЕРШОГО УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ВІДРОДЖЕННЯ *

1.

Як представляється очам більшості з нас наше 16-те століття? Ця доба, треба сказати, ніколи не втішалася величими симпатіями в нашій історіографії. Причин для цього є дві. Поперше: ця доба прогрішилася важко проти нашого сучасного ідеалу історії. Вона не витворила політичного оформлення, в якому проявився б наш сучасний ідеал національного існування — політична самостійність. Подруге: вона своїм життєвим стилем не відповідала смакам попередніх поколінь. Романтикам цю добу притамарювало козацтво, що вважалося одиноко типічним витвором українського духу. Позитивістам вона здавалася епоховою ретроградності та безпотребних зусиль із своєю „книжністю“ та „церковщиною“.

Прикроюючи історію під свій вузький смак, легко було забути про обов'язуючий при спогляданні історії принцип тягlosti розвитку, який каже трактувати епоху як звено постійного переходу від минулого до нового, каже бачити її ролю та її заслугу часто в тих розвитках, які тільки згодом пробилися на поверхню життя, оформилися в життєву домінанту та створили новий образ життя. Забуваючи про цю скриту часом під покровом далеких і незамічальних життєвих форм історичну місію епохи, легко остатись при кількох зов-

* Передруковуючи статтю покійного Ореста Зілинського з незначними правописними змінами й скороченнями, редакція надіється розпочати цикл статей-передруків різних авторів з історії української духовності. Стаття з'явилася перше в журналі Українського студентського середовища Німеччини та Австрії „Стежі“ 1, ч. 7-10 (1946-47).

нішніх, найбільш впадаючих в око признаках, оцінюючи їх з точки власних уподобань. Легко не дібачити, що за стилем життя, якого ми не старалися піznати, поза складом ідей, якого ми не захотіли проаналізувати в цілій суцільності, а тільки в найбільш маркантних для нашого зору виривках — може тайтися оця важка й важна для долі нації хвилина духової переорієнтації, звороту до нових вартостей, суспільної перебудови, що вища й важливіша від всіх принадних і присмних для нашого світогляду історичних фрагментів, бо вона, ця незамітна й безвиразна, здається, доба стала підбудовою культурному й політичному розвиткові кількох наступних століть. Таким способом ця доба, така ніби чужа й далека нам своїм способом ставитися до життя, була спітвірцем нашої долі.

Для звичайного українця, вихованого за філологічними методами нашої школи, 16-те століття — це тільки час перекладів Св. Письма, розвитку друкарства на наших землях, релігійної полеміки та кількох інших мало замітних історичних фактів. На всьому тому почіплена пожовкла й відстражуюча марка нудності, придана ворожим їй, одностороннім 19-им століттям, задивленим тільки у свій власний розвиток.

Ми будемо старатися в нашій статті трактувати матеріал тільки як матеріал, а не як змісл епохи. Для нас переклади, друкарство й полеміка перестають бути самоцільними, існуючими тільки для себе самих явищами, пов'язаними найвище спільністю часу й місця. Для нас вони тільки зовнішні й частинні прояви одного духового руху, який обхопив у рівній мірі всі ділянки тодішнього духового життя й відтиснув свою печать на формуванні подій. Для нас 16-те століття, це велике духовне потрясення, яке було початком зовсім нової лінії культурного й політичного розвитку. Це переміна основ побуту, світогляду, суспільної організації, доконана від ґрунту й основно в обличчі великої небезпеки.

В цій добі вперше замінено лягентні відпори на активну ідеологічну зброю. В ній винесено вперше суцільні програми культурного розвитку. В ній культура одержала нові соціологічні центри й нові спрямування. В ній вперше народилася національна ідея. В ній початок всіх культурних форм 17-18 ст., джерело наших пізніших культурних експансій і політичних оформлень. В ній вперше прийшло до відкритого зудару різноспрямованих духових сил внутрі нації для визначення найпевнішого й найбільш видайного шляху культурного розвитку. Врешті — в ній оформилася вперше на українському ґрунті людська особовість, в своєрідних та імпо-

зантніх постатах Вишенського, Потія, Смотрицького й інших, доказуючи тим самобутність духової раси.

Ці всі переміни — це все здобуток першого великого бою за українську культуру, що проходив в обставинах загрози національного існування. Ніколи в нашій історії свідомість провідних верств нації не була так тонко вигострена на велики проби, які ставила історична хвилина, на одиноку й наглу конечність опанувати *ідейними* засобами ситуацію, здобувати зброєю ідеї все втрачене у матеріальних боях. Ніколи така інтенсивна боротьба за власне духове обличчя не велася в такій драматичній обстанові. Навколо падали матеріальні фортеці, на які можна було досі спирати свою віру в перетривання та побіду над обставинами: денаціоналізувалися з непередбаченою скорістю цілі суспільні верстви, які несли до того часу прапор ідеї, падали разом із тим матеріальні засоби для ведення боротьби, зменшувався гурт невгнтих під натиском сильнішого ворога, але прапор рідної культури, що мав нести нації, як усе, перетривання і збереження, підносився все ще над тим гуртом непідкупних оборонців піддержуваний все новими руками. Він плив через час і яснів все новими барвами духових знайдень. В цей спосіб, у боротьбі за оформлення духового обличчя, найтяжчий час було перейдено. І ось тоді, коли здавалося, що сили доходять кінця, що приходить остаточний упадок, цей прапор підхопила нова сила, що стала в обороні все одної, хоча розшіплюваної й принижуваної нації — власна політична організація — українське козацтво . . .

Насвітливши склад і боротьбу ідей епохи, зупинимось над визначенням тих трьох орієнтацій культурного розвитку, які викристалізувалися з того шумування: традиціоналістичної, репрезентованої Вишенським, уніоністичної, очолюваної Потієм, та поступово-утраквістичної, найкраще оформлененої в львівській „Пересторозі“. Ми прослідимо, які середовища витворили ці три розвоєві лінії, наскільки західні духові форми, закорінені в тих середовищах, вплинули на цю формaciю. Це все дасть нам змогу визначити, як власне пробігав цілий культурний зудар, чи він мав образ діялектичного вирівнювання двох активних протилежніх духових принципів, чи може діяла тут тільки нова ініціативна сила на нездібну до відпору стару духову верству. Які власне елементи склалися на новий український світогляд і наскільки детермінували вони пізніший історичний процес? Що саме зі старої української духовості, спертої на візантійсько-цер-

ковнослов'янській базі, залишилося жити в новій системі поглядів на світ? З яких елементів виросла нова духовна синтеза, яка зумовлювала наш історичний розвиток аж до початку 19 століття?

Для цього треба знати перш за все, на яких принципах спиралося духове життя України до часу перелому, про який будемо говорити, який панівний світогляд накинув українській культурі її перший культурний круг, які ідеї керували життям українця 10-16 століття, як ці ідеї відбивалися в його житті, які вони викликували формaciї суспільної сфери й т. і. На ці всі питання повинен би дати принаймні загальну відповідь цей мій вступний реферат. Він мав би поставити пролегомена для добової аналізи ідей, роз'яснюючи, з якою ідейною збросою, з якими силами виступили в 16-17 ст. до бою за духову й соціологічну гегемонію оба табори: латинський і візантійський.

2.

Можемо зразу ж сказати, що Україна репрезентувала до 16 століття чистий, хоча й затертий сотнями років нерегенерованого вживання, культурний тип: східно-християнський, або візантійський. У час свого входу в історичне життя опинилася Україна в близькості сильного культурного центра — Візантії, яка не втратила ще тоді нічого із своєго Юстиніанського розквіту та являлася одним з найбільш виплеканих культурних центрів у цілому світі. Політична могутність Візантії загрожувала тоді навіть молодому західно-римському ціарству (Італія), її духовна культура виводилася в прямій лінії з римських традицій і виказувалася великими досягненнями довгих століть розквіту. Розбудова її матеріальної культури не зазнала потрясень і перерв, підтримувало її велике політичне й економічне значення імперії. У Візантії 11 ст. нагромадилося за обрахунками істориків $\frac{2}{3}$ усіх світових багатств. Культурні цінності цієї великої й щасливої держави, очолювані грецьким обрядом християнської релігії, струмували на цілу південну й східну Європу, аж до Італії та передньої Азії.

Як у кожній високо організованій зрілій державі, була в Візантійській імперії культура усвідомленим знаряддям в руках держави. Вона простягала омофор величі й добра над цією державою, що на її кордонах з усіх боків чатували ласі на добичу варвари (парти, болгари, печеніги, русь, араби, сельджуки), готові в слабу хвилину кинутися на принадні

й слабо боронені багатства. Цих варварів Візантія мала звичку присвоювати та обласкавлювати культурою й освітою, яка поволі вигладжувала їх різкий психічний тип і зв'язувала їх пошаною до новопризаного культурного авторитету. Для того, щоб підкріпити таку пошану, Візантія мала в руках могутню зброю історичного легітимізму. Ідея вічної незахитної столиці імператорів народу ромеїв, що від непам'ятних часів панував і досі ще панував над цілим світом, все побідний і непоборний, хоронений самим Богом, викликувала респект не тільки в півдиких варварських племен без ніякої історичної пам'яті, але й у більш культивізованих арабів і турків (не забуваймо, що Мугаммед II, що здобув остаточно Царгород, виводив себе для виправдання своєї сміливості з ціарської династії). Принцип окремої Божої опіки й ласки, підтримуваний інтенсивною фабрикацією корисних для держави чуд, був взагалі найсильнішою ідеологічною остоєю цієї держави дипломатів, що все воліла покорювати духовою зброя, ніж запускатися в безпотребні й небезпечні для себе кровопролиття. Цей принцип міг проводитися без заколочувань завдяки спеціальному положенню релігійної організації в Візантії: її цезаропапістичному завершенню. Церква в Візантії була вповні підчинена державі. Патріярхи назначувалися цісарями; вони походили часто з царського роду. Цілий церковний апарат був тільки одним із стовпів державного правління.

Саме цей найбільш вигідний і зручний, бо спертий тільки на духовій перевазі, чинник висувала Візантія проти своїх неприємних сусідів. Приманючи їх своїм матеріальним близком і розкішшю, вона давала їм тільки найбільш невичерпальний із своїх маєтків — релігію. Не мечем, а словом Божим, одягненим у пишні культурні атрибути, покорювала Візантія своїх диких противників. Вона запрошуvalа їхніх вождів до Царгороду й показавши їм розкіш будинків, купелів і прийняття, вела їх до св. Софії на святочну богослужбу, засипувала їх неземною красою матеріального багатства, просвітленого ім'ям Божим, видвигненого на славу Богові. Візантійські розкоші прибирали для примітивних чужинців із їхнім наївно-віруючим спогляданням світа характер релігійної тайни. В їхніх душах здобувала собі місце віра, що існує справді на землі пункт, де сам Бог сходить на землю, щоб осінювати вибраних людей, що поклоняються йому, своїми ласками й благодаттю. Тоді й вони бажали такого, христилися без спротиву, приймали патронат царя ромеїв та присягали на майбутнє виректися своїх поганих поганських зви-

чок. Візантія заключувала з своїми новими підданими корисні для себе торговельні договори, наділювала їх нічого не коштуючими, а зобов'язуючими й принадними почестями й титулами та придавала їм в почет одинокий реальний дар: грецьких місіонарів, що мали внести у своїому слові хоч трохи візантійської краси й ласки в суворий побут варварських країв.

Так зв'язалася з Візантією і наша стара Русь, правда, по доволі довгому нехтуванні візантійськими принадами, на які спочатку наловлювалося виховане поза твердою лицарською моралю жіноцтво (Ольга). Україна стала з прийняттям християнства васальною областю візантійської імперії. Її дальший культурний розвиток мав стати відповідно до того тільки відблиском великого політичного й культурного центру. Храм св. Софії, повністю взорований на царгородському, є наявним свідоцтвом і символом цього. Слава Візантії поширилася так сильно в глибину народніх мас, що закріпилася на десять століть в українському фольклорі (легендарний Царівград, вояк, що збирає військо й стає під непоборними мурами, не думаючи здобути його, а вимагаючи тільки окупу за свою хоробрість).

В'язи, якими обпутувала Візантія довколишні краї, були льокалізовані в священній області релігії. Це була область, де Божою санкцією найлегше було держати в послусі й контролі цілий чужий край, поки тільки патріярх, як начальний голова Церкви з правом назначувати єпископів, давати їм директиви та кидати анатему на непослушних, сидів у Царгороді й порозумівався з цісарем. Церковний апарат, контролюваний грецьким єпископатом, монополізував у своїх руках всю освіту і все культурне життя, всі дороги до здобуття духової зброї. Він виховував членів провідної верстви, вів літописання й політичні зв'язки. Князь мусів коритися йому, бо тільки тоді він давав йому своє священне благословення. Коли ж появлялися тенденції обсадити важливі місця місцевими людьми, або допустити конкуренцію західного християнства, то візантійські опікуни мобілізували всю силу релігійного авторитету, щоб повалити такі спроби. Згадаймо тільки боротьбу за митрополію Іларіона, яка взагалі можлива стала тільки тому, що саме в половині 11 ст. Візантія переходила великі внутрішні кризи та безпорядки. Згадаймо теж прокляття, кинене на голову Святополка Окоянного, який чайже робив тільки те, що робили всі князі, що бажали об'єднати Русь; тільки ж робив він це, не спираючись на патронат місцевої церковної організації, а проявляючи недвозначні

симпатії до західної культури й західного християнства, ненависних уже тоді візантійським світським і духовним кругам. Пригадаймо собі, що Володимир теж проганяв і убивав членів своєї рідні, але для нього Церква вміла знайти виправдання та вивищити його на рівноапостольського.

Візантійське культурне добро, яке приходило в Україну, мало у зв'язку з реферованим вище політичним стосуванням культурізації майже виключно духовний, релігійний характер. По суті переймала Україна культурні надбання не прямо з Візантії, але посередництвом молодої її епігональної, від самого повстання спрямованої виключно на релігійну область, церковно-слов'янської культури. Болгари, що послуговувалися загально зрозумілим слов'янським діялектом, свою культурізаторською діяльністю відпихали Україну від першого більш многостороннього культурного джерела, яким була безперечно Візантія, її подавали Україні духову поживу в виправціваний, спрепарований для виключно релігійних цілей формі. Церковно-слов'янська культура вимовляла собі в нас виключне право на культурне будівництво. Вона ставила обов'язуючі норми не тільки у суттєвих областях діяння релігії, як мораль, відношення до Бога, обрядовість, — але включувала в систему релігійної вихови такі справи, як загальна освіта, мова, мистецтво, вмонтовуючи їх без ніякої світської співпраці майже в непорушний обрядовий канон, де вони були певніші перед атаками позадуховних чинників. Вона не допускала місцевих світських елементів до культурної розбудови, навпаки — воліла накидати всім станам свою власну централізовану культурну продукцію (переклади з грецької мови, компіляції). Релігія мала бути повік єдиним дарцем культурних благодатей.

Це була перша причина того, що в нас довго не могли витворитися, а коли й витворювалися, то не могли втриматися *світські культурні центри*. Духовенство, школене в ідеалах універсальності релігійного світогляду й релігійного інтересу, надавало тон цілому культурному життю, виховуючи все нові покоління в послусі несеній собою релігійній культурі й світоглядові. Одиноким змістом цього світогляду стала розбудова чи, краще висловлюючись, культивація зв'язків між людиною й Богом. *Обрядові й етичні питання* ставляться одинокою ціллю людського життя; все цивілізаційне примінюється й узгляднується тільки в ряmcях широко розбудованої обрядовості. Старання про світ матеріальних речей, як об'єкт звичайного, щоденного життя й творчої праці людини, взагалі не існує. Впорядкування світа речей, його підчинення

духовим вимогам, його розбудова по лініях духового розвитку, цивілізаційна функція, якою так визначилася західня Церква, не існує для церковно-слов'янської духовості, як завдання людського життя, не кажучи вже про шукання духового в тих речах, чи їх телеологічне оправдання. Джерело такого відвороту від реального світу лежить в основній спрямованості східно-християнського релігійного світогляду. Його провідною зіркою є ідея аскетизму.

Візантійська доба принесла у східному християнстві виквіт аскетичних спрямувань, репрезентованих такими іменами, як Василій Великий, Григорій Богослов, Іван Дамаскин, Іван Літвичник. У боротьбі з сильним у візантійській культурній області геленізмом, що досягла свого вершка в 4 і 5 ст. після Христа, виформився східній, емоціональний тип людини такими сильними появами, що вони на довгі століття заважили над світоглядом східної Церкви. Тоді, коли на Заході прийшло до поєднання грецьких раціоналістичних течій, репрезентованих олександровською школою з Климентом і Оригеном та християнськими стойками з Боєцієм, із християнською ідеєю, Схід тривав при своєму світогляді фанатичного ідеалізму. Аскетичний ідеал життя став засновуючою складовою частиною цього світогляду. Виключність етично-догматичного цінування світу, дуалістично забарвлений ідеал відвороту від світу матерії та його прелестей, канонізація й одиночного оправдання чуттєвого шляху для зв'язку з Богом, ідеал духової простоти — оце найосновніші його риси. Ясно, що такі ідеї могли зродитися й мали своє оправдання на пекрвітненому культурно, пересиченому матеріяльною розкішшю, сточеному червяком егоїстичного релятивізму візантійському ґрунті. Там він спинував розклад пишно виквітнених культурних форм, замикав їх у рамці ідейної доцільності, не дозволяв втопитися в надмірі матеріального. Зате на сирому українському ґрунті цей ідеал спинував незамітно, але по слідовно всі очевидно конечні змагання до матеріяльної розбудови, реальну творчу снагу, поклав свою тяжку руку на дрімаючі розвоєві сили. Ченці, представники найбільш культурного в той час стану, замість ставати передовиками цивілізації, як це було в Західній Європі (бenedикти, бернардини, цистерції, ора ет лябора — benediktинський кліч), будувати величаві монастири й плекати інтенсивну аграрну культуру, сиділи в своїх печерах і пустельнях, плекали культ тілесного занепаду та думали про Івана Літвичника. Вони — носії духових напрямних у непросвіченій країні, стали першими будівничими ресистенції і втечі від творчого життя. Ясно, що

цього образу не можна узагальнювати: були й ченці вчені, переписувачі книг і творці самостійної духової продукції.

Але й на праці тих залишили свій слід некорисні риси церковно-візантійського світогляду. Він накинув їхньому спогляданню світу такі норми:

1) трансцендентальний ідеалізм. Поцейбічний світ трактується, як щось нестійне й незумовлююче людину. Тому пізнання й етична снага звертається виключно в бік світу ідей, умісцевлених у другому житті, що його обіцяє релігія. Справжній суспільний порядок переноситься теж на тамтоді світ, який єдино справедливий і добрий проти недосконалості тутешнього. З такої вихідної точки виходив Вишенський, відкидаючи згори можливість і потребу боротьби за справедливі відносини в земному житті.

2) агностицизм і віра в пізнання з ласки. Людський розум заслабий, щоб піznати істину. Тільки ласка Божа може привести вибраних святих до пізнання, проявляючи себе в надприродний спосіб (чуда).

3) безперсоналізм. Людина — це порох, в зв'язку з Богом отримує тільки запоруку майбутнього життя. Тому смиреність і затасння перед світом для здобуття прямого зв'язку з Богом — життєві постуляти.

4) духовність. Тільки витвори ласки Божої, що входять у склад релігійного передання, як Євангеліє, Святе Письмо, писання святих, обрядові книги, є одиноким джерелом справжнього духовного. Тільки те, що подає Церква — правдиве, все інше — спокуси дияволів.

5) неісторичність. „Сто літ у Бога, як один день”. Немає розвитку, як висліду праці людських рук чи ума. Бог кермус змінами в світі по своїй волі. Людина не є підметом розвитку видимого світу, такий розвиток взагалі не існує.

6) предестинативність. Життя людини складається з Божих інтервенцій, проти яких людина безоборонна („все от Бога”, допуст Божий). Спокуси, чуда й рятунки творять зміст життя. Ввиду того всі зла, теж і моральні, можуть трактуватися як допуст Божий і змиваються обрядовими актами (приклад: славне, дуже поширене оповідання про Григорія та його несвідомий гріх, збудоване на Едиповому мотиві. Однаке в східно-християнській інтерпретації немає клясично-грецького драматичного контрасту: особовість — доля, а є тільки епічний плив подій, кермований Божими інтервенціями).

Цікаво, що вищеперечислені принципи східно-християнського світогляду відповідають два перші й найбільш поширені

рені у нас оповідання, перейняті з латинського круга: легенда про св. Олексія з ідеєю відречення від влади та земного добробуту в ім'я вічного спасення, та про лицаря Тандала, що трактує про перспективи позагробного життя.

На таких основах спирався світогляд, який віціплювало Україні століттями східне християнство. Невгнутими сторохами цього світогляду були дві інші його норми: строгий догматизм і традиціоналізм. Задля першої з цих властивостей навіть внутрішній зв'язок з Богом, оця чинність, яка займала стільки місця в цьому світогляді, яка відривала людину від зацікавлення земним життям — цей зв'язок з Богом не міг бути ніколи живий і індивідуальний без страху пропинитися перед догмою. Він не міг бути навіть такий, як був у культічній релігії латинського середньовіччя, де він знаходив собі поле для прояву у містичному виквіті індивідуальності з ґрунту потойбічних справ і символів, у естетичному закоханні духовим елементом життя, якого не обмежувала ніяка догма (Августин, Екегарт, Катерина з Сієни, Франціск з Асізі, пізніше Беме), чи в боротьбі за провірений у життєвій пробі етичний ідеал (Августин, Гус), чи врешті в зриві творчого інтелекту до своєго духового центру (Тома Аквінський). Зв'язок з Богом обмежувався у нас тільки до апробативного пересвідчення про правдивість догм, що проявлялося зовсім змеханізовано в пишній обрядовості. Формалізація релігійного життя — це те явище, яке незвичайно виразно виникає на перший плян в упадкових часах нашої культури, де воно вже починає вважатися навіть чеснотою й ледве чи не одиноким способом здобути заслуги перед Богом. „Подумавши про спасення своєї душі, приїхав НН і записав монастиреві воск на свічки, добра, чи щось подібне”. Це звичайна формула викупу душі в 15 чи 16 столітті. По такому акті раз на все заведене в забуття все те, що робила дана людина до того часу, розв'язане раз на все питання її духової кваліфікації — вона може повернутися з переконанням про повне наладнання своїх зв'язків із Богом.

4.

Як сильно опанувала ця чужа українській психіці релігійна культура, якої властивості ми тут побіжно реферували, український духовий тип, доказують свідоцтва з недавнього простонароднього світогляду, де вона задержалася найдовше. Духова гегемонія Церкви їх там залонсерувала аж до 19 століття, і вони виразно виступають у повістях Квітки-Осново-

в'яненка, перехищенні із спорідненою чужинною літературою манерою, а теж і в Шевченка, в якого молодеча лектура Псалтиря є тільки одним, і то найбільш зверхнім свідоцтвом того, що він частиною своєї душі був приналежний до того світогляду. Теж народні приповідки, що походять із церковно-слов'янських книжних джерел, свідчать про те.

Зате не могли розвинутися ніколи вповні, аж до початку 19 століття *світські культурні форми*, що мусіли собі проборювати вкінці шлях тільки через бурлеск і пародію. Різдвяні й великої вірші є прикрем наслідком знасикування живої, дуже своєрідної психіки вузькими світоглядовими схемами, де врешті в пошануванні залишається тільки зверхня форма (в цьому випадку нагода, з якої і навіть в честь якої вірші писалися, а далі біблійна тематика), а внутрішній зміст їдко покривається насилиуючим людську духовість схемам.

Так отже панував у нашій культурі безплідний статизм відірваної від живого ґрунту, ексклюзивної церковної культури, що приходила до нас через треті руки, посередництвом чисто духовної старо-болгарської культури. Застоялість була тут вартістю, вона зв'язувала людей до добре знайомого й освяченого. Компілятивність була одинокою спроможністю обновлювати культурне добро. Замкнена дорога до шукання й розвитку, навіть у рямцях мережі догм, так, як знала її середньовічна латинська культура. Ізмарагди, Златії Ціп-и, Пчели, Прологи, Патерики (з того тільки один витворився на місцевому ґрунті) та подібні релігійні книги, доповнені кількома моралізаторськими романами та псевдо-науковими підручниками творять до 16 століття матеріал для формування духового типу українця. На те, що книжний фонд аж до того часу не змінявся, цебто освічені люди були аж до того часу примушенні черпати свою духову поживу з тих незмінних джерел, існують документарні докази, наприклад списки книжок Супрасльської бібліотеки з 16 ст. Не диво, що цей матеріал переївся. Він вже не витворював у нікого духових спонук і не побуджував нікого до духового досконалення. З 14 і 15 століттями маємо дослівно одне тільки нове доповнення до релігійної літератури (і немає причини думати, що було більше). Це оповідання про чудо на Великдень 1463 р., вставлене до Печерського Патерика. Своїм високим літературним рівнем воно свідчить про необнижено високі творчі спроможності тодішньої духової еліти. Таланти є, живе ще прекрасний стиль на церковно-слов'янсько-візантійських взорах, так близькуче проявленій у посланні Мисайлa з кінця 15 ст., але бракує, як каже Грушевський, „апетиту до діяльності”, творчо-

го ферменту, який родиться із справжнього панування живих ідей над людьми, активної снаги, що зумовлена живістю світоглядових основ.

Завмираючої ідейно духовної культури, на жаль, не могла заступити подавляюча її світоглядом культура *світська*. Двірська духовна культура витворювалася в нас вже у княжій добі, але невспіла розвинутися ще в тому часі, коли для неї існували корисні суспільно-політичні умови. Спочатку спинував її розвиток ексклюзивізм духовної культури (навіть нечисленні світські письменники княжих часів не могли емансипуватися з-під її впливу, як от В. Мономах, Д. Заточник, і тільки „Слово о полку Ігореві” одиноке стоять поза її тінню); пізніше перервало цей розвиток знищення тих соціологічних центрів, які створювали можливості для її розвитку. Дуже нечисленні пам'ятки цієї світської культури, як от згадуване вже „Слово о полку”, далі Слово про Лазареве воскресіння та Галицько-Волинський Літопис, кажуть нам жаліти, що на спробах тільки й закінчилося. Політичні події, які прийшли незабаром, мусіли знищити ці молоді зав'язки дірешти. Тяжко вже стало в нових умовах татарського лихоліття та чужого політичного поневолення говорити про князів-філософів, як от волинський Володимир.

Слабий розвиток двірської культури є для нас трагедією не тому, що не осталася нам з княжих часів більша скількість витворів рівня „Слова”. Багато гірше, що брак цієї культури не дав виплекати світських світоглядових схем, достосованих до реальних вимог суспільного побуту, схем, які могли б знівелювати шкідливо-односторонній ідеал аскета, який без огляду на щораз складніші умови життя невпинно октроювала Україні церковно-слов'янська культура. Наслідки фатальної односторонності духовного світогляду при недостачі світського світоглядового співчинника мали вже незабаром прикро датися відзнаки. Здається, що не найменше вирішив про упадок нашої державності побіч об'єктивних причин теж і *повний брак суспільної ідеології*, який відчинив широко ворота поступаючому розкладові власних суспільних форм та став троянським конем чужих політичних апетитів на українські землі. Областю суспільної ідеології східня Церква у протитенство до західної зовсім не цікавилася, канонізуючи кожний корисний для церковної організації суспільний стан і вважаючи суспільну сферу маловажною життєвою конечністю, де все проходить правом кадука. Тому закон п'ястука та звичаю, обмежуваний тільки такими звичаєвими інституціями, як на все додержувана родинна любов і

присяга, панує так виразно в суспільному побуті наших княжих часів. Цей закон перенісся на основні питання суспільної організації та став перешкодою для утривалення всяких суспільних форм, так станової організації, як і державного апарату. Поведінки київського міщанства з Ізяславом і В'ячеславом, а ще більше галицьких бояр зо своїми князями, не можна собі подумати в ніякому з країв середньовічної Європи, де святі були ідеї легальної влади, послуху й підчинення в ім'я релігійного світогляду, та тривалого гієрархічного суспільного устрою, над яким патронувала Церква своїм священним признанням.

Цікаво, що саме доба, в якій в умовах ускладненого й збагаченого суспільного побуту вперше різко виказуються браки східно-християнського світогляду, приносить у нас перші далекосяглі звороти на Захід. Крок вихованого на мадярському й польському дворі Данила, що стояв у своїй діяльності перед небувалими до того часу внутрішньо- й зовнішньо-політичними ускладненнями, а саме його коронація, цебто прийняття на себе ідеї легітимної влади, треба оцінювати як познаку його зацікавлення західною духововою організацією, і то не тільки для приподобання могутньому папі. Незабаром починають втискатися до галицької державної організації інші західні впливи (печатка, герб, писане приватне право, розбудова матеріяльної культури на західній зразок). Повстають перші суспільні клітини, організовані на зах.-європейський лад — міста на німецькому праві. Наплив чужинців і оживлення зв'язків із Заходом (хоча на дорозі стоять менш культурна ще тоді Польща) дають надію, що створиться в обставинах самосуверенності, як вислід власних розвоєвих потреб, а не як виплив інтересів чужої сили, культурне вирівняння між Сходом і Заходом. Але тимчасом державна будова паде під ударами ззовні й від внутрішньої порожнечі.

Вхід в нові політичні обставини, нове пересунення суспільних центрів (із великих міських княжих дворів, що були рівночасно осередками широкої матеріяльної розбудови й зв'язків зо світом — до містечкових садиб волинських князьків) приводить до того, що встоюється знову тільки давній, спертий на тверде соціологічне тло — духовенство, духовний тип культури. Правда, рівночасно культура пристосовується поширино до потреб щоденного життя (грамоти), але розвиток цих низинних ужиткових проявів не знаходить собі доповнення й завершення у справжній культурній творчості. Це знак, що і в нових, змінених обставинах життя церковно-

слов'янська культура нездібна опанувати образ життя. Її формальні засоби (мова, письмо, нижча освіта) використовуються тільки як матеріал для чужих оформлень суспільного побуту, що виростають із зовсім іншого ідеологічного кореня (традиція поганської Литви, західні впливи). Культурний стаж України підбиває сусідній край, але сама Україна опинюється під чужими порядками. В тому самому часі, коли продукти української культури заливають не тільки Литву, але й більш заавансовану культурно Польщу, на українських землях проходить процес послідовного суспільно-політичного упадку українства. Литва за Витовта переживає централізацію, бігом якої українська провідна верства залишається без політичних прав.

В Галичині без ніякого плянованого натиску з польського боку проходить скора денационалізація української шляхти. Елементи чужого матеріального побуту починають опановувати українські землі, українські провідні верства, що мали б солідарно боронити своїх групових інтересів, чи виборювати їх в нового володаря, переймаються аморфними тугами за чужими суспільними порядками. Вже саме те, що в Польщі існували вже в тому часі країці суспільні порядки при її невеликих цивілізаційних здобутках, свідчить про те, що скоріше виникнула туди організуюча сила західного духа й створила над життям якусь реалістичну ідейну надбудову. Однаке факт, що українська провідна верства не захотіла бачити свого майбутнього у самостійній боротьбі за нові форми суспільного життя й ідеології, а пішла нишком та без вагання одягатися в чуже пір'я, свідчить про те, що ця верства не мала в собі ніякого почуття суспільної місії, ніякого суспільного ідеалу. Денаціоналізація української шляхти в Галичині — не тільки сума матеріальних обставин; за цим розвитком стоять причини духової натури. Це, поперше — страшні недостачі в області персональних ідеалів, брак світського типу людини з його чеснотами та життєвими цілями; подруге — повний брак зрозуміння для суспільної сфери, що не була схоплена ідеологічно в область життєвих вартостей.

В Україні не було ясної й стійкої ідеї легітимізму, не було погляду поза моментальний інтерес одиниці в далеке суспільне майбутнє, не було почувань солідаризму, не було врешті волі витворювати нових організацій ані вартостей в області культури. Тому суспільні акти українців литовської епохи видаються нам безсенсивними зривами з обрахунком на побіду фізичною силою (повстання Світргайла проти Витовта й Жигмента, Михайла Олельковича проти Казимира (1481),

М. Глинського проти Олександра (1507-8). Вони приносять остаточно тільки даремне винищення національної еліти й не залишають по собі сліду в політичній традиції. Насправді над життям панує безрадність і настрій добровільних уступок. Подібним явищем є в Галичині повстання Мухи та пасивна надія на волоську інтервенцію. Зрештою акти спільнот постав українства в тому часі незвичайно рідкі; вони трапляються хіба в обороні релігійних інтересів (письмо Казимира Вел. до патріярха, заходи в справі львівського єпископства). Ці всі старання, що обмежувалися тільки до церковної області, доказують ще раз, що суспільний світогляд тодішніх українців тільки в цій області міг виказатися певним виробленням. Зате в області світської суспільної організації, замість територіально-станової солідарності, спільної оборони інтересів перед пришельцями, здобуває собі зразу ж ґрунт примітивна ідеологія проховзування в чужий табір.

Послідовна й недраматична денаціоналізація галицької шляхти, причому вона розплилася у неширокій верстві пришельців, це один із найсумніших розділів нашої історії і здається одне із найбільш виразних свідоцтв наших браків у духовій ділянці. Проти всяких загально поширених переконань треба зазначити, що сталася вона без поважного й послідовного натиску з ворожого боку, тільки як вислід повної недостачі власних об'єднуючих ідей, традицій і програм та найвіної надії на автоматичну розв'язку ззовні. Ніякої боротьби поміж національностями тоді й не могло бути. В тих часах зв'язує людей не національна ідея, а станові інтереси та ідея територіальної легітимності та культурної окремішності. Але навіть цих трьох ідей наша шляхта, бідна на духовий зміст, у тому часі не висунула. Вони всі мали розвинутися спізнено тільки згодом, разом із витворенням національного почуття.

5.

Національне почуття в нашому сучасному розумінні свідомості про приналежність до якогось суспільного організму із спільною традицією, культурним і соціальним побутом та спільним ідейним надбанням ще тоді не існувало. Воно тільки протягом 16 ст. почало виростати на новий ідейний рушій нашого суспільного розвитку, виринаючи на денне світло початково у дивних пов'язаннях із почуттям релігійної приналежності, та поволі збираючи під свій новий прапор всіх, у кого ще не згасла іскра любові до того, що в'яже людей в одну духову спільноту. На закінчення наших гене-

тичних студій добре буде кинути побіжні світла на середовища та обставини формування тієї національної ідеї, а далі на цю суспільну установу, яка мала дати цій молодій ідеї пристановище та опору у храмі своєго ідейного авторитету — Церкві.

Чинник національної окремішності проявляв себе вже від найдавніших часів при стику з чужим етнічно елементом (головно на пограниччях, в містах та під час воєн і окупацій) у простій протиставі свої — чужі, автохтони — пришельці, наші життєві інтереси суперечать із їхніми, але до ролі суттєвого й постійного фактора в житті він рідко коли піднімався. Тільки з остаточним задомовленням чужого елементу на наших землях, що наступило після віdboю наших земель чужинцями, повстали додіні обставини для підкresлення протиенств між „своїми” й „чужими” та вслід за тим створення свідомості про існування двох різних від себе груп, з яких кожна зв'язана внутрі якимись спільностями. Витворювання такого групового почуття в нас не проходило на ґрунті культурних різниць, а на ґрунті найбільш яскравих різниць у суспільному становищі поміж українським і польським, або литовським елементом. Це була зростаюча поволі правна нерівність українського й чужинного елементу. Засіб для определення до одної чи другої групи був дуже простий — пізнавальним знаком служила єдино віра, релігійна приналежність, яка в деяких станових організаціях, напр. у міщанському стані, вже з рациї самих правних залежень, перещіпленних зовсім механічно й без окремих політичних ухилів, із німецьких первозворів, була а пріорі принципом, який створював суспільну нерівність.

Суспільні установи латинського середньовіччя, що в їх відбудові брала участь і західня Церква, були творені тільки для одних людей — для правовірних християн західного обряду. На суцільному релігійно (крім міського жидівства) Заході цей принцип не приводив у практиці до ніяких труднощів; інакше було, коли його приносили з собою колонізатори на українські землі, застосовуючи його як аргумент для утвердження своєї надрядної позиції у боротьбі за матеріяльний успіх. В містах почалося найперше упослідження українського на релігійному тлі. Спочатку воно мало форму однічних, безплянових виступів, але десь коло половини 16 ст. починає набирати признак очевидності. Соціальні упослідження, пов'язувані звичайно із зневажуванням самого предмету різниці — віри й обряду, доводять до вигострення релігійної свідомості та її поступової ідентифікації з усвідомлен-

ням культурних і історичних причин різниці вір та суспільного становища. Повстає характеристична протистава: руська — лядська *vira*, а далі зроджена з плеканого віддавна Церквою духа обрядового принципіалізму та легітимізму протистава: грецька, цебто благочестива, віра — католики, називані часто у взаємність еретиками. У суспільній ситуації середини 16 ст., при втраті неправовірної шляхти й суспільному упослідженні правовірної та такому ж пониженні цілого українського православного міщанства, витворюється оцей міцний вузол, який в'яже в одне національний і релігійний інтерес і організує українство до близької відкритої боротьби за свої права під прапором релігійної солідарності. Релігія стає видимим репрезентантом національно-культурної традиції й побуту.

Причин на це існує дві. Поперше: релігія — це була (на жаль, запізно, в хвилині розпуки відкрита) одинока ідейна база, якою розпоряджувало тодішнє українство. Ідеї грали в тодішньому суспільному житті неабияку ролю й радо примінювалися, зокрема слабшою стороною, в боротьбі проти переваги матеріяльної сили. Як ми бачили вище, українство 16 ст. — затративши давно наслідком своєї світоглядової односторонності свою державно-політичну традицію — не могло знайти крім релігійної організації та віри ніякої іншої новій ідеї, підходящої під цей час. Релігія одинока, віра в її правду та право організувати людей, давала тодішнім змаганням українців ідейне оправдання й з'єднувала їх у бої за свої життєві права під кличами оборони святого, даючи їм надію на все, аж до віковічної заслуги на тамтому світі. Таким способом трапився дивний випадок: духовно-історична причина упадку перейняла на себе знову ідейно-організуючу чинність.

Другим мотивом, що спонукав українство організуватися на принципі релігійної солідарності, була конечність практично-організаційного характеру. Церква — це була одинока суспільна інституція, правда, можом тоді поросла й попроялювана, яка з рації своєї принципіяльної автономії не випала ще з українських рук. Вона була в той час щоправда установою радше матеріяльного, як духового характеру, але й це стало подекуди в пригоді новому рухові, віддало йому в руки певні матеріяльні ресурси та постійний доплив нових матеріяльних засобів. Із-за традиції матеріяльної функції Церкви змогли встоятися, наприклад, братства, де перше з успіхом використано ці матеріяльні прибутки, зв'язані з релігійними практиками, які досі лилися з рації людської побожності в

приватні руки владик і архімандритів — на діло суспільного будівництва (шкільництво, друкарні, шпиталі і т. і.).

6.

Як же виглядала в переломовий час ця остання фортеця, в якій замкнулися в стражданну годину останки національної еліти? Яке мала духове вивінування та організаційну традицію?

Українська Церква перейшла протягом 14 і 15 ст. зовсім подібні розвитки, як світські стани. Вона поволі піду падала. Причиною для цього був знову не зовнішній наступ на неї, а внутрішня інерція, викликана втратою духової пружності, якої причину ми вже знаємо, та деморалізацією носійного апарату — духовенства.

Навіть цей апарат, проповідуючий ідеї, не міг витривати на Прокрустовому ложі світоглядових примусів і віддавав себе без надуми прийнятим загально приземним ідеалам тодішнього світського побуту.

Українська Церква не терпіла в Польщі аж до часу Жигмонта III ніяких переслідувань. Вже Казимир, підбивши Галичину, прибрав зовсім толерантне відношення проти православія, стаючи на ґрунті „двох благочестій”, цебто легітимістичної рівноправності двох переходно відділених від себе Церков. Зрештою церковна політика Казимира виказує брак ясних напрямних. Намірившись спочатку католицизувати єпархію й ввести цим способом нормальні правні відношення в галицькій провінції, відступив згодом від цього пляну за спонукою галицької шляхти, звертаючись до патріярха з проханням про опіку над занедбаною митрополією, „аби не зник, не пропав закон руський”. Побіч того плянує Казимир закласти нову, латинську катедру у Львові, де не було православної катедри, й тим дає знову доказ своєго респекту для православних церковних уладжень. Катедра мала бути очевидно призначена для обслуги напливового латинського елементу. Теж заходи Володислава Опольського для закріплення латинської єпархії не мають проти руського вістря — це побожне старання про розбудову духовних інституцій. Тільки за перехрещеного на латинство Ягайла, який встиг себе виявити ворогом української шляхти на Литві, натрапимо на перші акти нехтування правами православних (відібрання перемиської катедри). Такі спорадичні випадки непошанування прав православної Церкви трапляються й далі. Однаке всі вони можливі тільки тому, що православна шляхта на-

віть не старалася вибороти своїй Церкві якесь ясно сформульоване правне становище, залишаючи її на ласку долі й обставин.

Процес упадку української Церкви сильно приспішила одна інституція, яка почала поширюватися з новим, чужим супільнім порядком. Це трактування духовенства як економічно-правного стану. Цей звичайний у середньовічні дуалізм службової матеріяльної позиції духовних і їхнього виховного покликання не міг приносити великих шкід, доки був добре контролюваний церковною владою й схоплений у сильні рямці канонічних приписів. Тимчасом така контроля з боку духовної влади у нас упадала щораз більше, починаючи від найвищого правного чинника української Церкви — царгородського патріярха. Після окупації Царгороду турками 1453, зв'язки, що були і до того часу не зовсім правильні, остаточно обриваються, — і тільки час до часу якийсь енергійніший патріярх пригадає собі справи української Церкви й намагається завести в ній які-такі порядки. Це в більшості випадків очевидно не вдається; коли раз уже виховзнулася керма управи з рук, тяжко її з далекого й відділеного кордонами Царгороду знову опанувати, тяжко визнатися про хід справ із фрагментарних, відірваних інформацій та прохань.

Верховну ініціативу в духовних справах переймають в 15 ст. світські чинники: король, великий князь (у справах київської митрополії теж і великий князь московський). Разом із тим вони не бачать перешкоди користуватися користями, які їм така функція дас. У східній Церкві було добре утриваленою звичкою, чи навіть обов'язком церковних провінцій матеріяльно підпомагати патріярший престол. Спочатку це були тільки данини з церковних доходів; далі, з послабленням релігійного ригору в Царгороді, теж і товариські дарунки за чинності, які по приписам не можуть підпадати ніяким оплатам (висвячення, корисні полагоди особистих справ срархів і т. і.). Звідти був тільки один крок до повного скорумпування, і цю можливість збіднілі візантійські патріярхи, позбавлені вже від 14 ст. матеріяльних підмог від також збіднілого царського двору, використовували дуже поквально, жебраючи крім того по цілій Європі на оборону святого міста.

Тепер, після порвання зв'язків з такими ненаситними патронами, всі користі молодої традиції підкупств та симонії перейшли на світську інвеституру. Вона не менше, як духовна, в'язалася канонічними приписами. Історія галицької та литовської Церкви 15 і 16 ст. повна занедбань і упадків, боїв

владик за персональні користі, дбання про свої доходи, а не про духовне добро, неуцтва та навіть найстрашніших злочинів. Галицький митрополичий престол залишався з половини 15 ст. необсадженим головно тому, що київсько-литовський митрополит хотів далі збирати для себе данину у землях вакантної галицької митрополії, а шляхті було довгий час до того байдуже, кому вона буде цю данину платити й чи брак єпископа не потягне за собою упадку єпархії. За церковні маєтки йде вперта запекла боротьба між латинською Церквою, яка присвоює собі до них право, та приватними особами. Треба підприємчих одиниць, як два шляхтичі Гдашицький і Тучапський, та порушення всіх кол підкупства (300 волів за духовні привілеї королевій Боні), щоб задніми дорогами осягнути те, що можна було від початку тримати правом, та в правному характері намісника, щебто виключно економічного управителя виконувати потиху духовні функції.

В Литві є подібно. Єпископи вибираються світськими чинниками, які забирають безборонному патріярхові зв'язані з тим доходи, обмовляючи, що він діє „по веленію турецкого царя”, отже його постанови незаконні. Єпархія не знає ніяких принципів навіть у питанні признавання зверхньої влади, хитаючись то тут, то там, відповідно до хвилинної коньюнктури, щоб тільки бути добре баченою й виминути всякі труднощі. Вона дас себе охоче потверджувати папі (Григорій, Місайл). Номінації з'являються як відповідь на добре помазані „прощенія”. На довгі роки перед смертю перепродують духовні особи свої становища охочим наступникам; з другого боку робить це королівський двір, який теж не нехтує доходом. З таких трансакцій виходять часто непорозуміння. Буває, що кількох конкурентів заявляє свої документовані права на єпископство чи архімандрію, і в браку розсуджуючого чинника спір полагоджується регулярною війною, як це було в славному випадку війни на володимирське владицтво між Йоною Борзобогатим і Теодором Лазовським 1565 р., що її по-мистецьки змалював Орест Левицький. Владики спорятали титули й місця на соборах.

Подібні розкладові звички заводяться і поміж нижчим духовенством. Найкращим доказом упадку тієї організації, що мала розбудовувати духову ділянку, можуть стати вимоги, ставлені для священничих свячен: вміння читати й писати, жадних теологічних знань. Множаться світські надання. Духовенство стає нічим більше, як економічним станом, в якому гуртуються люди, охочі втекти перед суспільним на-

тиском і тяжким хлібом. Церковна розбудова в 16 ст. набирає із-за цього ненормальних розмірів. Неменше 10-ти% всієї людності — це люди безпосередньо зв'язані з Церквою. Церква стає для них засобом господарського прожитку. Багаті громадяни фундують церкви, „аби сини Костя й його брати мали з чого живитися...”, як каже відкрито одна грамота. Духовний стан стає родинним підприємством. Кожний піп виживлює біля себе членів родини в характері діяконів, дяків, паламарів, проскурниць. Елементи формалізму здобувають собі панування в релігійному світогляді та уділюються без спротиву світським колам, формуючи їх погляд на релігію. Матеріальні дотації, такі побажані для духовних, загаль но вважаються одиноким шляхом до спасення. Цей викривлений погляд на істоту віри втискається навіть в область духової продукції; так, наприклад, в одній легенді записана людина проживас цілий рік ненарушеного під землею, бо жінка його приносить у церкву свічки, хліб і книші.

7.

Так отже бачимо, що духовенство, одинока за вказівками старо-української світоглядової системи носійна верства духової культури, тоне у ще завзятіших, як шляхта, боях за матеріальний успіх. І на цей стан, який стояв під найбільш безпосереднім впливом високих книжних ідеалів, вплинув загальний у тому часі настрій сибаритизму, відвороту від духових справ, поникнення в проблемі матеріальної наживи й безжурного вживання життя та опанував його без решти. Не знайшлося праведників, які змогли б поставити проти упадкової стихії сильне слово, боротьбу за відновлення духового змісту в житті, ідеал духової активності. Бракувало цим праведникам, хоча вони й були, живого духовного кореня, ідейної спадщини, яка гуртувала б їх в одне та вела до нового розвитку. Тільки пізніше зумів Вишенський силою своєї могутності індивідуальності поставити ще раз на давньому життєвому ідеалі величну будову духової повноти.

Ціле українське громадянство переживало напередодні великих змін, які несло із собою близьке зіткнення з західнією культурою, оцей фатальний час, коли затратилася ясна розвоєва лінія навіть у свідомості провідних одиниць, коли духовна культура, позбавлена ідейного та соціологічного ґрунту для виростання носіїв і пророків, перестала панувати над життєвим образом, створювати орієнтаційний лук ідей над життям, бути єднаючою на основі вищих справ силою. Ці не-

достачі причинилися спершу поважно до соціологічного краху української провідної верстви, а рівночасно захитався у стику з новими побутовими умовами остаточно український духовий тип, виплеканий на принципах духовної, відверненої від життя, формалізованій і закостенілій у своїй упадковій стадії, але все освяченій та догматичній релігійній культурі. Із вінка чеснот, якими обдарувало нас колись східне християнство, до 16 ст. змогли перетривати тільки дуже нечисленні: родинна любов. Тодішній образ духового життя опановує дивна дволичність: з одного боку мертвте, номінальне тривання при старому, яке вщіплює сильно закорінена вага догми в житті, з другого ж боку бездушний хід за принадними модами, які пливуть із чужини. Ця загальна дволичність — це найкращий доказ автоматичності душевного життя тодішньої провідної верстви, що має свою причину в браку живого й самобутнього духового змісту в собі самих. Україну заливає щораз більше згубна хвиля західної цивілізації, обнаженої з усіх внутрішніх вартостей. Після Люблінської Унії здобуває вона відкритий вступ на всі українські землі і втискається до кожного закутка, де ще досі правом інерції застоялось старе. Здається, що приходить українській культурі остаточна загибель, потонення у чужому культурному заливі, здання цих позицій, які єдино відрізнювали нас до того часу перед світом.

Але ось ми свідками нових, несподіваних розвитків, в яких поволі на ґрунті власних народніх традицій повстас нове духове оформлення. Підносяться з сірої товпи уживаčів життя задивлені в добро люду посполитого Скорина та Тяпинський, творчі Броневський, Смотрицький чи Зизаній, твердий як скала у своїй первісній шляхетній чесноті Вишенський, майстри нового слова, прекрасні творці земної краси, майярі Пересопницького рукопису та Рогатинського й Богородчанського іконостасів, сибарити переміняються в мучеників, що охочі терпіти за свою ідейну справу навіть тілесні переслідування . . .

DOCUMENTING THE UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST MOVEMENTS

Introduction

Published primary documents describing the Ukrainian nationalist movements (UNM) during and just after the Second World War vary in quality. Materials brought before the public have often been tendentious and presented seemingly only to substantiate the claims of one or another ideological faction.

Possibly this situation could be corrected if the documents now scattered throughout the diaspora were gathered into a centralized, professionally managed archive. Such a collection could be complemented with the taped testimonies of adherents of the various UNM now living in the West. Any such repository would soon become an invaluable resource for students of the UNM.

Such an undertaking is, regrettably, unlikely. No academic institution now functioning in the West seems willing to attempt such a long-term project. Another impediment lies in the fact that many important papers are held presently by individuals disinclined to present them for scrutiny by non-partisan scholars. Now inaccessible, most of these documents ultimately will be lost as their guardians die and their personal archives fall into disorder or are destroyed. Coupled with this is the unwillingness of many former activists to detail their own experiences during and just after the war. When it is realized that vast numbers of documents were lost or destroyed during the tumultuous years of their origin and that others were captured by enemies of the UNM, the full gravity of the situation is understood.

In consequence, distortions about the UNM abound. While many untruths have been cultivated by those hostile to the UNM, it is ironic that many participants in the struggle even now refuse to discuss their experiences. Thus they confine their own pasts to the peripheries of history. To all intents and purposes, what is not recorded as history is forgotten.

Efforts are now being made to publish selectively important documents about the UNM.¹ Such undertakings are to be applauded. However, information about this critical conjuncture in East-European history cannot continue to be restricted to those fluent in Ukrainian. Published Ukrainian documents have little impact if they are not accompanied by unabridged and professionally translated English versions.

* * *

Non-Ukrainian sources have likewise remained under-exploited. Yet, it is clear that if the successes and the failures of the UNM are to be thoroughly understood, then the archives of other peoples and governments, friends and foes, need to be searched. Any assessment of the UNM based only on Ukrainian sources runs the risk of being considered biased. It will certainly be incomplete.

Fortunately, more than thirty years have elapsed since the UNM were most active. Thus, many papers dated before 1951 are now open for public inspection. Even if the selective "weeding" of many files has removed possibly crucial evidence, the fact remains that preliminary studies can now begin.

The importance of one non-Ukrainian archive has already been described,² and another is discussed in this issue.³ Finally, it might be mentioned that increasing numbers of scholars, notably T. Hunczak, E. Shtendera, M. Yurkevich and Z. Zvarych, are now gathering and cataloguing primary-source materials on the UNM.⁴

* * *

¹ See, for example, the *Litopys UPA* series of documents, ed. E. Shtendera and P. Potichnyj (Toronto. 1977-), four volumes published thus far.

² Lubomyr Y. Luciuk, "The Public Record Office: An Important Source for Archival Materials on Ukraine," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 74-80.

³ See Lubomyr Y. Luciuk, "The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace: Its Significance for Ukrainian Studies" in this issue.

⁴ See, for example, Myroslav Yurkevich's "The Ideology and Program of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists: A Preliminary Bibliography" to his Ph.D. dissertation (in progress), University of Michigan.

Journal

The Public Record Office (PRO) in London, England houses a considerable number of documents pertaining to the UNM. One of the more intriguing sets of documents uncovered is the Foreign Office file FO 371 47597, titled "Ukrainian Nationalist Movements." Prepared in 1945, it was utilized by officers of the FO, the Foreign Office Research Department (FORD) and the War Office (WO) for several months. This is attested to by the signatures and initials of such prominent members of the FO as Thomas Brimelow (of the Northern Department) and Mrs. B. Miller, the FORD's "expert on Ukrainian affairs."

The documents appear to be largely a recapitulation of captured German (probably SS) materials, which themselves were probably based to some extent on reports of informers within the UNM. They confirm that the British and, probably, other Western powers not only knew about the UNM, but also had a partial idea of their antecedents and importance. They also reflect the extent of naivete and erroneous information within British intelligence. The Ukrainian expert, Mrs. Miller, does not seem to be aware that the Skoropadsky movement had virtually no influence within Ukraine and probably based her judgement on Danylo Skoropadsky's activities in England. Her information on Stepan Bandera's death in 1943 is simply incorrect. In fact, it was Bandera's brothers, Vasyl and Oleksander, who died in Auschwitz, at the hands of Polish inmates. This misinformation might possibly be the result of the efforts of someone highly placed in the British Foreign Office who played a role not unlike that of Kim Philby.

The documents have been bracketed and annotated to correct factual errors, transliteration (which seems to be based, curiously enough, on the Russian) and to indicate questionable interpretations. The reader is left to judge the value of the Foreign Office's appreciation of the UNM. However, these documents do not represent the entire FO view. They illustrate the (probably misplaced) reliance of the British on German sources and contain only partial clues to the British policies towards the UNM. A more complete unravelling of British views remains to be done. Nevertheless, these documents indicate a need for the Ukrainian intellectual community to clarify errors of fact and opinion about Ukrainian nationalist movements, both past and present.

Lubomyr Y. Luciuk

FO 371 47957 XIN 07286

Registry
Number N 17195/4356/38

FROM War Office
(communicated)

No M/3c/Ext/146/45
secret

Dated 13th Dec. 1945

Received
in Registry 18th Dec. 1945

Ukrainian Nationalist Movements.

Transmits copy of a study on the
Ukrainian Nationalist Movements, pre-
pared from German military documents.
Copies F.O.R.D. [Foreign Office
Research Department]

(Minutes)

This is a most interesting report. The odd thing about it is that the local population seems to have been willing to support both Ukrainian Nationalist Partisans and Soviet Partisans. This seems to indicate that they were not greatly interested in the Ukrainian Nationalist issue as such, but were willing to help anybody who claimed to be fighting in their interests.

TB [Thomas Brimelow] 23/12/45

This report is most useful, but in places so much telescoped as to be somewhat misleading. For example, no mention is made of any Ukrainian political organisation save O.U.N.; this was admittedly the most important [although] there were several others. In particular the most pro-German of all the movements, the S.H.D. [Soiuz Hetmansiv Derzhavnykiv], followers of Hetman [Pavlo] Skoropadsky, had by [now] nearly died out. Skoropadsky himself died in April 1945, but before his death he appointed one Boris Homsinav [Borys Homzyn] his successor. His followers have recently made application to the British authorities in Germany to contact the old Hetman's son Danylo who is living in England.

Para 1 section b. It seems most unlikely that Andreas Melnik [Andrii Melnyk] should have joined the Soviet partisans, as he was the leader of the whole O.U.N. movement, even though [Stepan] Bandera & [Mykola] Lebed, being younger & more fanatical, had usurped some of his authority.

According to a Stockholm source Bandera died in a German concentration camp about November 1943.

In connection with Mr. Brimelow's point concerning the volatility of Ukrainians, some distinctions must be made. First, the main nationalist

Journal

centre was Galicia—the Volhynians were more inclined to compromise. Second, the Communist partisans were strongest in the towns, & the local population there tended to go in with them, while in the countryside the Ukrainian partisans were better able to continue with their hand against every man.

In any case the Soviet partisans were far better armed than any others & many Ukrainians joined them simply in order to secure arms.

B. Miller F.O.R.D.

Minutes.

ROOM 17.

I should be grateful if you could pass the attached papers to Major Seton-Watson. The entered paper is the one I promised to let him see when he and Mr. Footman came to see Mr. Allen. The loose paper is the property of Mrs. Miller of F.O.R.D., our expert on Ukrainian affairs. I should like to know whether this Bulletin is regularly and easily obtainable.

Thomas Brimelow
13th January 1946.

MI3c/Ext/146/45

SECRET

From: M.I.3(c)
War Office

To: T. Brimelow Esq.,
Northern Dept,
Foreign Office.

13th December 1945.

I enclose for your information one copy of a study on the UKRAINIAN Nationalist Movements, prepared by this section largely from German military documents. A copy has also been sent to F.O.R.D.

Any comments you may have would be appreciated.

Please acknowledge receipt on attached duplicate memo.

[Illegible signature]
Captain
for Major G. S.

UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST MOVEMENTS.

CONTENTS.

1. General

- (a) Historical Background (1917-1939)
- (b) Wartime Developments (1939-1941)

2. The TARAS BULBA Movement.

- (a) Origins
- (b) Partisan Activities
- (c) Organisation, Strength and Membership
- (d) Armament
- (e) General Policy
- (f) Later History (1942-1944)

3. The OUN-UPA Movement (1942-1945)

- (a) Origins
- (b) Partisan Activities
- (c) Organisation
- (d) Strength and Membership
- (e) Armament
- (f) Policy (g) Later History

4. Soviet Counter Measures

- (a) Military Action
- (b) Deportation of Families
- (c) Pan-Slav Propaganda
- (d) Anti-Separatist Propaganda
- (e) Constitutional Changes

5. Recent History of Ukrainian Movement.

6. Future Prospects.

Appendix 1 — GERMAN report on UPA Organisation.

Appendix 2 — RUSSIAN order concerning anti-BANDERA Measures.

Appendix 3 — SMERSH order concerning security with reference to OUN-UPA.

Journal

1. General.

(a) Historical Background (1917-39). The collapse of the Russian Empire early in 1917 and the defeat of the Central Powers in November 1918 were in each case followed by the setting up of Ukrainian Governments in the areas thus liberated, which, for a short period at the end of 1918, bid fair to unite the Ukrainians in one state. The campaigns of the Poles and Bolsheviks in the next two years however left the Ukrainian people once more divided between three foreign rulers in Poland, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

In Poland, the Ukrainians retained a considerable liberty of organization, particularly in the social, cultural and economic fields, and Polish East Galicia continued to be the main centre of Ukrainian nationalism. Political unity of the Ukrainians in Poland was largely achieved, both in the parliamentary field and also in the shape of the O.U.N. (Organizatsiya Ukrainskikh Natsionalistov — Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists), a para-military secret society formed in 1929. This latter body carried out sabotage and assassinations directed against the Polish administration, as it was later to do against the Soviets in 1944-45. Ukrainians had largely looked to Germany for support in establishing their aim of an independent Ukraine, and after Hitler's rise to power the O.U.N. came strongly under Nazi influence.¹

The Ukrainians in Czechoslovakia, in the Carpatho-Ukraine, were comparatively backward and not actively nationalist, though here also irredentist forces received support from Germany. The settlements of 1938-39, which distributed the Ukrainians of these regions between Hungary and the Soviet Union, caused considerable disillusionment among the O.U.N. as well as other Ukrainians of similar leanings who had counted on Germany for support.

In Soviet Ukraine an extremely liberal policy towards Ukrainian nationalism was followed at first, in spite of the abolition of the separate diplomatic service of the Ukraine S.S.R.² From 1930 onwards however Ukrainian separatism, in conjunction with the discontent caused by Soviet agricultural policy, became a serious danger to the Soviet Union. This danger was substantially aggravated by the advent to power of Hitler in 1933. Ukrainian nationalism became an object of attention by the G.P.U., and simultaneously the movement was undermined by the policy of industrialization which brought large numbers of Russians into leading

¹ Links did exist between certain German ministries, the Abwehr (German army intelligence) and the UNM. However, the OUN never came "strongly" under Nazi influence.

² It is debatable whether the Soviet Ukraine ever witnessed a "very liberal" policy towards Ukrainian nationalism.

administrative positions in the Ukraine and greatly increased the economic dependence of the Ukraine on the rest of the Soviet Union.

The arrests and trial of Ukrainian nationalists in the Soviet Union from 1930 onwards offered *prima facie* evidence of attempts to form Ukrainian separatist bodies inside the Soviet Ukraine, and also of the connections of Ukrainian individuals with the O.U.N. and foreign powers. There is evidence that, during the period of German occupation of the Ukraine, the O.U.N. had branches throughout the Ukraine which worked in the utmost secrecy (including, of course, secrecy from the Germans). No evidence is to hand, however, of the activities of the O.U.N. or of any other separatist organization in the Soviet Ukraine before the war.

(b) Wartime Development (1939-41). During the years 1939-44 [sic] the movement appears still to be suffering from disorganization as a result of the assassination of the leader of the O.U.N., Colonel [Ievhen] KONOVALETS, and the manifest failure of his pro-Nazi policy.³ (One group, led by Andreas Melnik, split away from the O.U.N. and in 1942 had almost become a part of the Soviet partisan movement).⁴

On 28 Jul[y] 1941,⁵ the O.U.N. leadership in LVOV [Lviv] issued a proclamation of Ukrainian independence; the arrest by the Germans of the O.U.N. leader, Stefan Bandera, which followed, led to further disintegration. The organizations which emerged, the "TARAS BULBA" Movement and the U.P.A. (Ukrainska Povstanchiska [Povstanska] Armiya—Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army) were, however, not mutually hostile and the latter eventually largely absorbed the former.

2. The Taras Bulba Movement (1942-44).

(a) Origins. Was led by [Taras] Borovets, a prominent member of the O.U.N., who before the war had been engaged in literary activity against Polish and Soviet authorities. In 1940 he started to organize partisan and other disruptive activity in the part of Poland which had been occupied

³ Konovalets never expounded a pro-Nazi policy. See Ihor Kamenetsky, "Ukrainske pytannia v nimetskii zovnishnii politytsi mizh dvoma svitovymi viinamy," *Ievhen Konovalets ta ioho doba* (Munich, 1974), pp. 851-82.

⁴ Melnyk did not split away from the OUN. In 1940 a split occurred between the older, moderate leadership under Melnyk and the younger, "revolutionary" cadres inside Ukraine led by Bandera, Lebed and others. This led to the creation of two OUN factions with different orientations and tactics, both claiming to represent the Ukrainian nation. See John A. Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 2d ed. (New York, 1963); reprinted 1980 by Ukrainian Academic Press, Littleton. Col.

⁵ The actual date was 30 June 1941. The proclamation was made by the Bandera faction of the OUN and was followed by German arrests.

Journal

by the Soviet Union. During the German advance in 1941, he disarmed the Soviet authorities in the town of Sarny [in northern Volhynia] and later handed over the town to the Germans.

At his own suggestion Borovets was then entrusted by the German forces with the task of forming a special police force, the "Poliska Sitch", to mop up Red Army stragglers in the forests of North Volhynia.⁶ He accomplished this task and had several successful engagements with Red Army units, his force having at one time a size of 2 thousand men. Negotiations for further "operations" and expansion, however, broke down and the "Poliska Sitch" was disbanded by the Germans. In February 1942 Borovets started negotiations for its reconstitution, but without success.

Thus Borovets saw himself frustrated in his aim of building up under German auspices the nucleus of a future Ukrainian army. In the meantime with the introduction of the German civil administration in the Ukraine, it had become clear that, far from independence, the Ukrainians could expect little but sanctions and repressive measures from the Germans. In the summer of 1942 Borovets took to the forests with some of his men, and adopted the name of "Taras Bulba".

(b) Partisan Activities. Activity by Bulba bands is reported from September 1942 onwards, and included the following:

- (i) battles with Soviet partisans.
- (ii) attempts to dislocate the German civil administration, e.g. re-distribution of requisitioned grain, raids on state farms, liberation of prisoners.
- (iii) raids on German units and posts, with a view to getting supplies, in which, however, the shedding of German blood is said to have been avoided.

These operations took place mainly in the region PINSK-LUNINETS-SARNY-ROVNO-LUTSK-KOVEL, that is to say roughly the Southern half of the Pripet Marshes.

(c) Organization, Strength and Membership. No evidence is available of any form of rigid organization in the Bulba movement. German estimates of the armed strength of the movement during the years 1943-44 vary between 5,000 and 20,000. A statement of June 1943, which may possibly emanate from Bulba himself, gives the strength as 40,000 men organized in 15 camps. It is likely that the active strength was in fact limited by the supply of equipment.

⁶ Bulba-Borovets acted on his own initiative and was not "entrusted" to form the Poliska Sich by the Germans. He had set up his resistance force in northern Volhynia before the outbreak of the German-Soviet war.

(d) Armament. This consisted mainly of machine guns, machine pistols and rifles, though anti-tank guns are also mentioned. Sources of supply are raids on German units, actions against Soviet partisans, deserters who bring their own weapons and deception of Soviet planes carrying supplies to Soviet partisans.

The movement recruited its members exclusively from Ukrainians but included amongst them those of every political leaning. The original nucleus of the movement consisted of deserters from the German auxiliary police formations and other Ukrainians who had come into conflict with the German civil administration. Later, however, Bulba was able to institute a compulsory call-up in parts of Volhynia and Polyesia [Polissia], the German administration being permanently effective only at focal points.

(e) General Policy. The principal aim of an independent Ukraine was to be achieved, either after the mutual exhaustion of Germany and the Soviet Union, or alternatively by developing Partisan activities to such an extent that Germany would be forced to modify her Ukrainian policy. As regards political conditions in the planned "independent Ukraine" the movement appears to have had no policy at all. This vagueness of policy may have been deliberate, with a view to enrolling the largest possible number of supporters; it was however to prove a weakness when competition developed between the UPA and the Bulba movement.

During the German occupation of the Ukraine the movement preserved an attitude on the one hand of willingness to negotiate with the German Army and on the other hand of hostility to the German civil administration and Soviet partisans. There are however isolated reports of temporary non-aggression agreements between Bulba and Soviet partisan groups during actions against the German civil administration.

(f) Later History (1942-44). Attempts by the Germans to induce Borovets to give up his illegal existence and to join them in fighting Soviet partisans lasted from October 1942 to April 1943. In those negotiations Borovets characterises the German administration in the Ukraine as "plundering" and the Reichskommissar himself as a "bandit". In his final letter to the chief of the "Sicherheitsdienst" in Rovno he threatens reprisals against German military objectives and lines of communication for any further German acts of barbarity against the Ukrainian civil population. A further meeting between Borovets and German agents took place in June 1943, at which it appeared that he was willing conditionally to negotiate with the German forces, but nothing seems to have come of this.

By this time the U.P.A. in VOLHYNIA had become a substantial force, and increasing penetration of the Taras movement by U.P.A. mem-

Journal

bers was taking place; in addition the movement is reported to have been losing members to the Soviet partisans. In November 1943 Borovets found himself so much weakened as to swallow his objections to negotiations with the German "Sicherheitsdienst" (Security Service). His offer, details of which are not known, was referred by Himmler to Hitler and turned down. In January 1944 Borovets was in the custody of the German Sicherheitsdienst in WARSAW under safe-conduct. Early in 1944 Borovets reappeared as the head of a new organization, the UNRA, Ukrainian National Revolutionary Army, which was active in the same region as, and presumably largely identical with, the Taras Bulba. Like that organization it considered itself an inter-party organization, and tried to recruit followers from Ukrainians of all political views. A propaganda leaflet suggests that the UNRA was hostile to the UPA, and was sympathetic to, or possibly even included, the radical Melnik group. Information as to its activities and organization is extremely scanty. Nevertheless the fact that the UNRA and the UPA were the joint objects of an appeal to come over to the Soviet side, issued by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, indicates that the UNRA must have been of some importance.

The unification of Ukrainian parties which took place in June 1944⁷ is reported to have included the UNRA and the Melnik group. Partisan activity, directed against Soviet line[s] of communication, and directed by Taras Bulba, is reported in the Polish [?] region as late as December 1944.

3. The OUN-UPA Movement (1942-1945).

(a) Origins. At about the same time as Borovets' attempt in 1941-42 to train up the nucleus of a future Ukrainian Army under German auspices, another section of the OUN Leadership was seeking, with greater success, to achieve the same end by sending its members to join the German Army as volunteers. It appears that a large part (perhaps 50%) of the personnel of the German SS division "Galicia" fell into this category. The eventual military leader of the U.P.A., [Roman] Shukhevich, is said to have served as a captain in this division. The setting up of the

⁷ This probably refers to the creation of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (UHVR) in July 1944 by the Bandera faction. The Melnyk faction did not join. The council proclaimed itself the "supreme organ of the Ukrainian people in its revolutionary liberation struggle." The goal was to create a broad basis for military struggle against both the Germans and the Soviets. The council controlled the UPA and through the OUN conducted anti-Soviet actions and propaganda. Membership was open to all parties that supported the aim of Ukrainian national independence.

UPA Movement began in mid-1942, but the nucleus of trained fighting men arrived only in the winter of 1942-43, in the shape of mass desertions from German SS volunteer divisions, which desertions continued at intervals throughout 1943.⁸ By the middle of 1943 the UPA was estimated to have 50,000 armed men in the region KOVEL-ROVNO-ZVIAHEL [Novohrad-Volynskyi]; by the end of 1943 it had spread to Galicia and was able to undertake the clearing from the N[orthern] slopes of the Carpathians of Soviet partisans with a view to using that region as a base. Immediately prior to the reoccupation of the Western Ukraine by the Red Army the UPA was in control of large areas between the Carpathians and the River Pripet.

(b) Partisan Activities. Before the Soviet reoccupation of the West Ukraine the main activities of the UPA were recruitment and training. Its only practical achievements during this period appear to have been the expulsion from parts of the West Ukraine of Soviet partisans and Polish peasants. Many of the latter had been settled there by pre-war Polish governments and placards were put up in villages announcing the dates by which Poles had to remove themselves to the West side of the San River. Those who failed to comply had their houses burnt down.

The UPA was also antagonistic to the German civil government in the Ukraine, and to Polish Partisans of all kinds. The extent of actual hostilities between the UPA and these bodies is however not known.

Hostilities on any substantial scale between the UPA and the Soviets date from April 1944, when UPA territory began to be reoccupied by the Red Army. The movement of the Soviet-German front across the region caused some disorganization in the UPA's activities, but in September 1944 95% of UPA units were reported to be behind the Soviet lines. The disappearance of the German civil administration in the Ukraine had by then removed the main obstacle to cooperation with the Germans. UPA activities included:

⁸ The UPA's origins are misrepresented here. It was organized before the SS division Galicia was even formed, and the Bandera OUN even boycotted it in its formative period. Shukhevych was never a captain in the division, although he was active in the Ukrainian legion (Roland and Nachtigall battalions), which fought alongside the Wehrmacht in the early days of the German-Soviet war. The legion was interned after the 30 June 1941 proclamation of independence. Then it was transferred to the Belorussian front, where many of its officers and men escaped into the forests and swamps and formed the UPA. See Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism*; Wolf-Dietrich Heike, *The Ukrainian Division "Galicia": The History of Its Formation and Military Operation (1943-1945)* (Toronto, 1970).

Journal

- (i) Attacks on Soviet supply columns moving up to the front, both by road and by rail; some stretches of railroad were rendered unusable, and armed escorts for convoys moving by road were becoming essential.
- (ii) Battles, apparently mainly defensive, against NKVD and Red Army troops.
- (iii) Liberation of conscripts from the reoccupied areas.
- (iv) Terrorism, directed mainly against officials of the Communist Party, the NKVD and the Soviet Government. One German intelligence unit regards it proved that General Vatutin's death was the result of such an attack at SHEPETOVKA [Shepetivka].⁹
- (v) Annihilation of Soviet parachutists.
- (vi) Transmission of intelligence on the Red Army to the German forces.
- (vii) Assistance to German stragglers, including their passage through the Soviet lines.
- (viii) Assistance to occasional German long-range reconnaissance groups.¹⁰
- (ix) Extensive propaganda amongst the Ukrainian civil population and amongst Ukrainians in the R.A. [Red Army].

Operations by the UPA against Soviet line[s] of communication and officials are reported up to and including March 1945, the date of the latest available information, the operations covering roughly the quadrilateral KOVEL-PRZEMYSŁ-STANISLAV [Stanislaviv, now Ivano-Frankivsk]-KIEV.

- (c) Organization. During the years 1941-44 the leadership of the OUN-UPA movement was in the hands of Lebedj [Lebed] (Alias Maxim Ruben [Maksym Ruban]) and Shukhevich (alias Klim Savur), the political and military deputies respectively of Bandera, who himself was in German custody in BERLIN.¹¹

⁹ General Vatutin was indeed ambushed and mortally wounded by an UPA group. See Mykola Lebed, *Ukrainska Povstanska Armia* (n.p., 1946) and Enrique Martinez Codó, "Guerilla Warfare in the Ukraine," *Modern Guerilla Warfare: Fighting Communist Guerilla Movements, 1941-1961*, ed. Franklin Mark Osanka (New York and London, 1962), pp. 112-27.

¹⁰ Fraternization and cooperation with the German forces was expressly forbidden by the high command of the UPA well before 1944. The court-martial and execution of UPA leader Orel was a result of one such breach of discipline. See Lebed, *Ukrainska Povstanska Armia*.

¹¹ Bandera was initially in Berlin in Gestapo custody, but he spent most of the war in German concentration camps.

A report of November 1943 describes a combined headquarters of the movement, then situated in the town of STYDIN [?], 45 km North of ROVNO. With the staff of the UPA there were said to be:

- (i) Headquarters of the security service (a secret terrorist organization).
- (ii) Supreme party executive.
- (iii) Directorate of medical services.
- (iv) Supply department.
- (v) Training school for officers and NCOs.

In the same report the UPA itself was stated to be organized in three divisions, each of 10-12 thousand men. These divisions were divided into regiments and companies (termed "Sotni" or "hundreds"). Further details of the organization at lower levels is given in Appendix 1.

(d) Strength and membership. German estimates agree on a strength of 40-50 thousand men for the UPA in the latter half of 1943, which towards the end of 1944 had risen to about 100,000. It is not known whether at this latter stage the UPA forces were still organized into divisions of about 10,000 men. There are many reports about this time of UPA groups acting in strength of 2-5 thousand. This great increase of strength in 1944 is partly to be accounted for by the reoccupation of the West Ukraine by the Red Army which had unwelcome consequences for a large part of the population. The reoccupation of every village was followed within a few days by a call up of all men between the ages of 18-50 usually conducted by an officer of the NKVD. Those who had collaborated with the Germans were, according to the degree of their offences, either summarily executed, sent to the interior for further investigation or sent direct to penal companies. The remainder, with the exception of certain party officials and those who had been with the partisans for more than one year, were sent to ordinary companies of reserve regiments. For the West Ukrainians these units appear to have been only a modified form of punishment company, where by bravery in the face of the enemy they might expiate their offences against their Fatherland in not having actively resisted the Germans. They were given 5-10 days training and were sent ill-armed and ill-clothed in the most dangerous parts of the front; casualties and desertions seem to have been heavy.

Originally the UPA had encouraged its supporters to present themselves for recruitment as the Red Army reconquered the W. Ukraine, hoping thereby to utilize the training facilities of the Red Army for its own benefit, as it had used previously those of the German Army. The use of the West Ukrainian recruits as cannon fodder caused this policy to be reversed. Cases were frequently reported in autumn of 1944 wherein UPA units attacked the guards of parties of recruits, the majority of whom were alleged to join the UPA after their liberation.

Journal

During 1944 a number of German stragglers joined the UPA. They were found in command of units and also in technical capacities. Units composed of dissident nationalities in sympathy with the aims of the OUN, e.g. Caucasian, are also reported as having fought with it.

(e) Armament. Originally light and heavy machine guns, machine pistols, rifles. Later in November 1943 each division of 12 thousand men is reported to have at its disposal two 3in guns, four to six anti-tank guns, as well as mortars. In 1944 tanks are occasionally reported. Further details are given in Appendix 1.

(f) Policy. As with Ukrainian Movements, the cardinal point in the policy of the OUN was the establishment of an independent greater Ukraine. Its political propaganda spoke much of civil liberties, and had a mildly socialist character; MOSCOW and BERLIN were depicted as foreign imperialisms coveting Ukrainian wheat, while LONDON came in for criticism as a stronghold of capitalism. After the unification of Ukrainian parties in June 1944, a more precise political programme was adopted.

The movement was uncompromisingly hostile to the German civil government in the Ukraine, the Soviet Government, the NKVD, Polish forces of both the London and Moscow groups, Poles living in the Ukraine, and the Vlasov movement. The movement was willing to negotiate, always solely with a view to its own benefit, with the German Army and the Hungarian Army. The only non-Ukrainian body with whom the OUN appear to have been on good terms was the Serbian national partisans, with whom an agreement is reported to have been concluded in March 1944 not to assist Tito's organization. As has been stated above, the OUN originally hoped to achieve its aims with German assistance but these hopes were repeatedly shattered. As in 1944 the impending defeat of Germany became increasingly obvious, there are reports of the OUN seeking support in England, and vice versa. All these reports lack confirmation; the most specific one of them states that Maxim Ruben, (alias Lebed), the political leader of the OUN, travelled to England via Spain in April 1944, presumably in order to canvas support.

(g) Later History. Negotiations between UPA and the German Army units at a purely local level are reported from early 1944 onwards on a basis of mutual non-aggression and the exchange of German arms for intelligence on the Red Army. During negotiations on a higher level in June 1944, the UPA sought without success to make the agreement conditional on the German Army using its influence to improve the treatment of the Ukrainian population by the German civil administration. A final agreement, between German Army Group North Ukraine and the UPA leadership was made in August 1944, with the approval of the Reichsminister concerned and Himmler, the German civil administration in the

Ukraine having ceased to exist. The UPA insisted throughout on negotiations with the Germans being kept secret, in order not to prejudice its propaganda inside the Red Army.

The policy of the German Army on the Ukraine question was reviewed late in 1944. The conclusion was reached that the Ukrainians did not institute a separate nation, and that as the freedom of the national minorities depended on the defeat of the Red Army, all the forces of the dissident minorities should unite under General VLASOV. This decision represented a considerable victory for VLASOV, who had been putting forward this view for several years without securing German agreement; sympathy in the Ukraine for the German cause was however likely to be annulled by it.¹²

4. Soviet Counter Measures

(a) Military Action. During 1944 military action by the Soviet authorities against the UPA is reported on an increasing scale. The troops used for this purpose were drawn in roughly equal numbers from the Red Army and the NKVD; the direction of the campaign against anti-Soviet partisans was, in rear areas, the responsibility of the NKGB. The number of troops engaged was estimated at one time as about 40,000, of which the Red Army contribution would naturally be drawn from the most reliable divisions. It is known that Soviet Ukrainian partisan personnel were often employed for this purpose under the control of the NKVD, after their zone of operation had been re-occupied by the Red Army.

(b) Deportation of Families. The removal (mainly to Siberia) of families of known UPA members, as of other politically unreliable persons, was widely carried out in the West Ukraine, and seems to have been one of the most effective methods of undermining the UPA movement. It does not seem however that these measures were normally applied collectively to whole villages.

The policy of deportation of dis-affected elements naturally brings with it the danger of building up centres of resistance in the reception zones. Mixed German-Ukrainian partisan activity in the Soviet Far East was in fact reported in November 1944, from a reliable source.

¹² The vagaries of German policy manifested themselves long before 1944. Conflicts on policy between the Wehrmacht, the SS, the Ostministerium and Hitler effectively destroyed any opportunities the Germans may have had for securing the cooperation of Ukrainians in their war with the USSR. See Alexander Dallin, *German Rule in Russia, 1941-45: A Study of Occupation Policies* (New York and London, 1957), and G. Reitlinger, *The House Built on Sand: The Conflict of German Policy in Russia, 1939-1945* (London, 1960).

Journal

(c) Pan-Slav Propaganda. A Pan-Slav movement was founded by the Soviet authorities in August 1941, in order to turn to the advantage of the Soviet Union the fact that Germany either had destroyed or was seeking to destroy all independent Slav states, and to represent the Soviet Union as the protector of the Slavs. Though not designed solely or even primarily with a view to the Ukraine, this propaganda move appears to have had a wide response there; this is no doubt partly to be accounted for as a natural reaction on the part of the population of the occupied territories to foreign rule in the Ukraine and in particular to the Nazis' estimate of themselves as "Herrenvolk" and Ukrainians as "asiatisches Untermenschentum" (Asiatic sub-humans).

(d) Anti-Separatist Propaganda. Reference has been made above to the appeal issued in early 1944, from the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine S.S.R. to the members of the UPA and UNRA. A free pardon was offered to those who deserted to the Soviets. In the same document the Soviet Union was represented as having achieved the union of the Ukrainian people by its march into Poland in 1939.

(e) Constitutional Changes. Early in 1944 the constituent republics of the Soviet Union were granted the right to maintain their own separate Ministries for defence and foreign affairs. There can be little doubt that this measure was largely intended as a concession to nationalist feeling in these republics particularly in the Ukraine.

5. Recent History of Ukrainian Movement. As mentioned above, in June 1944 the various Ukrainian resistance groups united into a Union for the Liberation of the Ukraine (Spilka Visvoleniya Ukraine [Spilka Vyzvolenia Ukrayiny]), from which there was constituted a Supreme Liberation Council (Ukrainska Golovna [Holovna] Vyzvolna Rada). Under this, a shadow government was set up with ministries, supreme court, etc. It is not certain that this government had any but a nominal existence. There are, however, a number of reports of areas in the West Ukraine coming under the control of Ukrainian resistance movement, during the winter of 1944-45. It is likely that the Soviet hold on this region at that time was concentrated on big towns and lines of communication.

The political programme put forward by this organization attempted to cater for both the peasantry and those of liberal and socialist leanings. This programme provided for civil liberties, and the socialisation of heavy industry and transport, while for agriculture it was proposed to set upper and lower limits to the amount of land that an individual might hold.

6. Future Prospects.

In World War II, as in World War I, the Ukrainian movement did not begin to attain the necessary unification and organization until it was

too late for full advantage to be taken of the mutual pre-occupation of Germany and Russia. With the defeat of Germany and the disappearance of the operational commitments of the Red Army, NKVD and NKGB it cannot be expected that the UPA will be able to keep its forces in being for many months. Moreover, the UPA like all partisan movements was dependent in many ways on the whole-hearted support of the population of the territory in which it worked, and up to April 1945 there was every indication that [the] policy of transporting UPA sympathisers to Siberia and elsewhere was being remorselessly carried out. When we add to these considerations the inevitable Sovietisation and Russification of the West Ukraine under Soviet rule it will be seen that Ukrainian nationalism has little prospect of being anything more than a nuisance to the Soviet Union in future years of peace.

APPENDIX 1.

The following data on UPA organisation, tactics and supply circumstances are given by a German reconnaissance group, who spent a month behind the Soviet lines in the Carpathians in Oct-Nov 1944. Throughout this period the group received guidance and hospitality from the UPA organization:

Frontaufklärungskommande 202
bei Heerengruppe A

In the field,
22nd November 1944

Subject: Results of Operation "Kirn"
Results of Observation of UPA

SECRET.

I. Organization. The smallest tactical unit is the group (RIY) strength one leader and nine men.

4 groups form a platoon (CHOTA) 4 platoons form a company (SOTNYA) 3-4 companies form a battalion (Larger tactical units were not observed)

Specialist personnel are attached to a company for particular duties, e.g. scouts, liaison, supply and provost personnel.

The total strength of a company in the field may be 160-180 men.

The issue of orders takes place daily, mostly in the evening through the C.S.M.

Battalions work for the most part independently of one another, liaison being maintained by couriers or despatch-riders.

Journal

In addition to the above combat units, there are so-called "local" or "political" combat groups (MISTSEVI BOYOVKI). These differ from the regular troops by being resident in their zone of operations. Their strength does not normally exceed ten men. They carry out police duties.

The leaders of the various UPA units from group to battalion are known as "RIYOVYI", "CHOTOVIY", "SOTENNIY" and "KOMANDIR" respectively.

The official mode of address is "DRUZHNE" (comrade) e.g. "DRUZHNE COMANDIR".

Other ranks also address one another as "DRUZHNE".

II. Discipline. The discipline is patterned on that usual in German units.

Relations between superiors and their subordinates are largely on a comradely basis.

A smart soldierly bearing is maintained.

Orders are carried out with precision.

Disobedience is severely punished.

For severe offences floggings are a common form of punishment.

Desertion is punished by shooting (deserters are sought out and arrested by police).

III. Tactics.

Meticulous selection of an opponent.

Only profitable actions undertaken.

Avoidance of open battle.

Preparations for a typical undertaking.

Thorough reconnaissance.

(a) through the civil population (TSIVILNA ROZVIDKA) the results of which are often exaggerated and vague. Hence, in addition —

(b) military reconnaissance (VIYSKOVA ROZVIDKA).

When these two types of reconnaissance agree with one another, a plan of attack is drawn up.

Duties are allotted and arrangements made in consultation with someone who knows the locality concerned.

Time and place for rendezvous are fixed. Approaches to the locality involved are watched. Telephone lines are cut. One to two hours after dusk is regarded as the most favourable time for the attack.

The scene of the attack is left the same night. Retreating units endeavour to cover up their tracks.

When a unit stays in the same area for some time, actions are carried out only in neighbouring areas. Conspicuous movements are forbidden in the locality where the unit is situated except for essential tasks, e.g. procurement of supplies.

Movements of larger formations take place mostly by night. Marching in the day time is only possible in large stretches of forest. A company proceeds by platoons. Guides escort the units from place to place, or from forest to forest. The destination is reconnoitred a day or two beforehand. While on the march roads and inhabited places are avoided. Occasionally a platoon will be billeted in one place. Camps are pitched in the forest. Camps are guarded day and night by double sentries up to a radius of half a mile. Persons with local knowledge are sent out to spy out the land and procure food. When a unit intends to stay some time armed patrols are sent out into the neighbouring countryside. It is difficult to take a UPA unit by surprise, since the population to the extent of 99% work for the UPA willingly and with enthusiasm. The population is extraordinarily suspicious and wary of any stranger.

IV. Armament. Units are armed for the most part with Russian weapons. Pistols and hand-grenades are 90% of German or Hungarian origin.

German sub-machine guns and machine guns occasionally.

Members of the S.S. division "Galicia", however, are armed and equipped 99% with German material (LG 34 and 42; MP 40 and 43).

Automatic weapons of Slovakian or Hungarian origin are rare.

Armament of a group:

- 1 light machine gun (Russian)
- 2-3 carbines (Russian)
- 1-2 carbines (German or Hungarian)
- 2-3 sub-machine guns (Russian).

Platoons mainly armed with heavy machine-gun; occasionally mortars and special weapons.

The local and political combat-groups are less heavily armed. Occasionally machine pistols, mai[n]ly pistols or carbines, small arms being better for their tasks.

Ammunition:

Apparently plentiful. Dump about seven miles away from actual quarters.

Shortage of pistol ammunition 7.65mm and 9mm.

German weapons are preferred, but German ammunition in short supply.

Care and maintenance of weapons: great shortage of material for this purpose. Weapons nevertheless in good condition.

V. Equipment. A great shortage of equipment of all kinds. Bivouac tents, haversacks, slings are uncommon; rucksacks are improvised from sacks; spades and axes are even more scarce; ammunition pouches are likewise improvised by the individual; mess tins and water bottles

Journal

are also in short supply; shortage of washing and shaving utensils, tooth powder and tooth brushes (one rasor blade to ten to twenty men).

VI. Dress. Footgear is mainly of German and Hungarian origin. Shoes and boots are made locally. However material available does not suffice to cover requirements. German Army and locally produced underwear is worn. As a result of the shortage of underwear there is widespread infestation.

For uniform, items of German, Russian and Slovak uniforms are worn. Greatcoats are in short supply.

VII. Supplies. The inhabitants of individual villages are made collectively responsible for supplies to UPA units, 90% of which process takes place without friction. In some places "Ukrainian State Stores" are formed for this purpose. Elsewhere a village headman (Starichi) is made responsible for supplies to the troops.

Inside the units distribution of food takes place through a Q.M.S. equally for officers and men.

The usual cooked dish is a nourishing tasty stew. Captured field kitchens are available.

Distribution of provisions for morning and evening, e.g. butter, etc., takes place according to availability (similarly tobacco).

Salted and smoked ham, and sausage, are put by as an "iron ration". A great shortage of salt and spices.

Signed in Draft
KIRN
Captain & Kdo. fuhrer.

Witnessed
Oblt & deputy Kdo. fuhrer.

(Translation of a translation
of a captured order).

APPENDIX 2.

Defensive and Counter-espionage measures
against the Banders [Bandera]
Movement.

Translation
of Regimental Order of the 258th KHABAROV Rifle Regt
of 14. Jan. 1944.

With the entry into the Western regions of the Ukraine the regiment may come into contact with anti-Soviet elements, the bands of Bandera, and must be prepared in the near future for acts of terrorism.

It is ordered that:

1. No one may go out alone.
2. No one may go out unarmed.
3. Baggage wagons may not go out singly, but only in groups of not less than five. For every group of wagons a baggage commander is to be detailed. Drivers must be armed. Ammunition supplies are to be guarded.
4. The rear services will deal with the security of the operational zone.
5. Headquarters guards are to be strengthened. Their quarters must be close together.
6. If necessary the civil population is to be moved out of houses occupied by H.Q. personnel.
7. No arms are to be left unguarded in quarters.
8. Care is to be taken in guarding W/T stations, telephone cable-offices and telephone lines.
9. The vigilance of personnel is to be intensified. All necessary measures for the preservation of secrecy are to be strictly carried out.
10. Acceptance of alcoholic drinks from the civil population is to be strictly forbidden.
11. Individual partisans and partisan groups in the battalion area are to be carefully scrutinized.
12. Guard duty in the battalion is to be strictly maintained.

The battalion commander is personally responsible for the execution of the above orders.

A report that the order has been carried out is to be submitted by 0800 hours 15. 1. 1944.

Chier of Staff (Maj. KHARLAMOV).

APPENDIX 3.

STRICTLY SECRET.

To the

Senior Commissioner in the 985th Regt.,
Comrade [RASKATOV].

Find out immediately who, in the units of your regiment, was born in, has lived in, or was recruited as replacement in the districts of MALIN [Malyn], POTIYIVKA, and CHOPOVICHY [Chopovychi] [in Zhytomyr oblast]. All such persons are to be carefully watched by agents, in order to seek out among them agents of the "OUN".

In the forests of these districts armed bands of OUN followers (Ukrainian Insurgent Army — UPA) are in hiding.

Journal

It is not impossible that amongst the new replacements from these districts members of the OUN-UPA could infiltrate into our units.

Lists, with statements and evidence, are to be sent to the "SMERSH" department.

The plan for the employment of agents in respect of the above category is to be submitted in person on 11. 1. 1944.

Chief of the Counter-Espionage Dept "SMERSH"
of the 226th GLUKHOV [Hlukhiv]-KIEV
Red Banner Rifle Div.
(Signed) Capt. GRAVILOV.

8. 1. 44

REVIEW ARTICLES

Thomas M. Prymak

MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY: POPULIST
OR STATIST? *

In 1912, while imperial Europe lumbered steadily towards the Armageddon that has come to be known as the First World War, the future Communist leader, V. I. Lenin, was living the life of a little-known political exile in a quiet provincial city of Austrian Galicia. In Cracow, Lenin sat down to unravel, as best he could, the intricacies of the perturbing "national question" that so vexed the multinational Hapsburg monarchy and its neighbouring states in eastern Europe. The question was particularly acute in Galicia, for this province was the centre of both a successful Polish cultural revival and a quickly maturing Ukrainian national movement. Lenin filled some seven scribblers with notes from the writings of various contemporary authorities. He began with the Austrian and German Marxist theoreticians Otto Bauer and Karl Kautsky, but by the second notebook, he had turned to his native Russia. The heated polemics on the emerging Ukrainian question first drew his attention; it was a tract by the Lviv history professor and cultural activist, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, that he took as most representative of the Ukrainian cause.¹

Lenin did not waste his time. By 1912 Hrushevsky was already in the centre of the storm over the Ukrainian question. To

* *Mykhailo Hrushevsky u 110 rokovyny narodzhennia, 1876-1976.* Edited by M. Stakhiv and M. Chyrovsky. *Zapysky NTSh*, vol. 197, 1978. 236 pp.

¹ See *Leninskii sbornik* 30(1937): "Materiialy po natsionalnomu voprosu," introduction, p. 4, and Lenin's terse notes on Hrushevsky's *Ukrainstvo v Rossii: Ego zaprosy i nuzhdy* (St. Petersburg, 1906), pp. 25-6.

his compatriots he was a respected scholar, the author of a monumental *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, and the miracle worker who had almost single-handedly organized what aspired to be a national Academy of Sciences in the Galician capital, Lemburg (Lviv). To his reactionary enemies, Hrushevsky was the "mastermind behind Ukrainian causes," the "heresy-arch" (*eresiarkh*) who had practically invented the modern "Little-Russian" literary language. It was Hrushevsky who attracted the praise, and it was Hrushevsky who drew the fire.²

The development of extreme varieties of nationalism in central Europe and the rise and fall of fascism have further complicated the issue. The master historian has became a symbol of different things to different camps. Like an ancient icon, Hrushevsky is venerated by the faithful, who are now old and few, while more generally he has been typed, classified and relegated to a Museum of Atheism and Anti-religious Propaganda to receive official abuse and to keep him a safe distance from a curious public. To a few political émigrés and Ukrainians living in the West, Hrushevsky remains the heroic scholar who became the first president of an independent Ukraine. But to Western scholars in general, he is little more than another intellectual "awakener" pounding the tribal drum of ethnic nationalism in a remote corner of eastern Europe.³ Meanwhile, in the Soviet Union, tight proscriptions and history by party committee and by party thesis have reduced Hrushevsky to the status of a bourgeois-nationalist, anti-scientific inventor of a false scheme of Russian and Ukrainian history. Serious scholarship simply does not exist, and in Soviet

² See Ivan Franko's classic evocation of the Ukrainian cultural explosion of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, *Moloda Ukraina* (Lviv, 1910); on Hrushevsky's pivotal role, see pp. 73-4, 132-4. For the attack on Hrushevsky, see S. N. Shchegolev, *Ukrainskoe dvizhenie kak sovremennyi etap iuzhnorusskogo separatizma* (Kiev, 1912), and Lenin's notes cited in n. 1.

³ One of the few English-language contributions to Hrushevsky scholarship is S. Horak, "Michael Hrushevsky: Portrait of an Historian," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 10 (1968):341-56. W. E. D. Allen, in his *Ukraine: A History* (Cambridge, 1941), cites Hrushevsky frequently but cautions his readers against his "nationalist" interpretations. Written on the eve of the Second World War, Allen's history is very much, as he states in his preface, "an English understanding" of the changing map of eastern Europe. For a critical review of the literature, see B. Budurovych, "Mykhailo Hrushevsky v otsintsi zakhidno-evropeiskoi i amerykanskoi istoriohrafii," *Vyzvolnyi shliakh* 20 (1967): 171-81.

Ukrainian publications Hrushevsky is almost never cited as a reference or listed in a bibliography.⁴ In this way, fruitful discussion of his role in modern Ukrainian history has been limited to a small circle of Ukrainian-language publications appearing in the West.⁵ Even within this circle, however, the stormy debate over Hrushevsky's role continues.

* * *

Among his younger contemporaries, the short, balding professor with the long grey beard and the twinkle in his eye was somewhat of a father figure, a personal link to the older generation of Kievan Ukrainophiles, and a symbol of the unity of Galicia and Dnieper Ukraine. His radicalism and his daring in the days of the Central Rada endeared him to the younger Socialist Revolutionaries (SRs), who formed the backbone of the Ukrainian revolution. Both he and they stood in the populist (*narodnyk*) tradition. Thus they put their hopes in the Russian and Ukrainian countryfolk and viewed the bureaucratic state in an entirely negative light. In contrast to the Marxists, Hrushevsky and the SRs hoped to escape the evils of Western capitalism and to follow a separate path to social betterment.

⁴ His name appears more frequently in the footnotes of Russian historians, who cannot be accused of Ukrainian nationalism. For a typical, highly stylized Soviet invective against Hrushevsky, see M. A. Rubach's article on him in *Sovetskaia istoricheskia entsiklopediia* (Moscow, 1963), 4: 857-8. This article is critically dissected by V. Dubrovsky in *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, 1966, nos. 1-2, pp. 107-10. See also M. Halii, "M. Hrushevsky i 'Ukrainska radianska entsyklopediia,'" *Vilna Ukraina*, no. 42 (1964), pp. 29-38.

⁵ Volodymyr Doroshenko is the author of a series of balanced articles on Hrushevsky that appeared in the literary magazine *Ovyd* (Chicago) in various numbers for 1957. Liubomyr Vynar has written a number of important studies of Hrushevsky, the most substantial being *Mykhailo Hrushevsky i Naukove Tovarystvo im. Tarasa Shevchenka 1892-1930* (Munich, 1970). Dmytro Solovei has analysed attitudes in the memoir literature towards Hrushevsky in his useful study "U spravi zhytiepysu M. S. Hrushevskoho," *Vilna Ukraina*, no. 17 (1958), pp. 9-21. The Ukrainian Historical Society has made a special project of collecting Hrushevsky materials for its archive. The most important of these, and many new studies as well, appear in the Society's journal, *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. In 1966, on the occasion of the centenary of Hrushevsky's birth, nos. 1-2 featured a selection of articles and a bibliography of works about him.

More conservative Ukrainians viewed Hrushevsky's predilection for the SRs as a betrayal of his nonpartisan position at the head of the new Ukrainian People's Republic and as a break with the historically minded local patriotism of the past. They accused him of worshiping the popular masses and ignoring the constructive role of other social groups. They held him responsible for the Ukrainian defeat of 1918, pointing out the basic contradiction between his anarchist style of thought with regard to the state and his actual position at the head of an emerging governmental structure. To these reform-minded conservatives, many of whom turned further to the right in exile, Hrushevsky was a historian who ignored their traditions, a statesman who denied his state-building function, and the leader of a nation at war who, preferring to rely on the unorganized masses and vague talk of federalism and liberty, foolishly disbanded his army at the critical moment. Hrushevsky was trapped in the paradox of his populist thought. Thus, observed one of these critics, "he loved liberty all his life and all his life he lived a slave."⁶ Hrushevsky was a *narodnyk*, pure and simple, and his mission had failed because of it.

Hrushevsky's failure was the failure of the generation of 1917. But the participants in the revolutionary events of that year were mostly very young men who lived on to dream of fighting another day. Many of them went into exile and were caught up in the stormy events of mid-century. Buffeted about by war and fleeing the westward march of Stalin's armies, some of them arrived on the shores of North America and once again took up the struggle. This is the story of the late Matvii Stakhiv, editor of this most recent book on Hrushevsky and the author of some of the more important articles in it.⁷

Mykhailo Hrushevsky on the 110th Anniversary of His Birth is a defence of the Ukrainian historian and political leader, and an attempt to elucidate and diminish the tension between the populist and statist elements in his work. In general, the book

⁶ Evhen Onatsky's remark is quoted approvingly by Bohdan Koval in the conservative compendium *Idei i liudy vyzvolnykh zmahan* (New York, 1968), p. 181. More generally, see O. Pritsak's essay, "U stolittia narodyn M. Hrushevskoho," in the same volume, pp. 187-230.

⁷ In interwar Poland, Stakhiv was a leader of the Ukrainian Social-Radical Party, an educator and a public figure in his own right. See P. Stercho, "Matthew Stakhiv: Scholar and Outstanding Ukrainian Civic and Political Leader," *Ukrainian Quarterly* 35 (1979): 31-42. The numerous typographical errors in the volume under review are due to Stakhiv's untimely death.

tries to show the positive side of the populist tradition as it is revealed in Hrushevsky's life; it suggests that a constructive scholarly career and the hard experiences of revolution and civil turmoil combined to strengthen an appreciation for the idea of the state already present in his thought. It is a reply to Hrushevsky's critics on the right, and it is an analysis of how the Soviet stereotype of him came to be formed.

The book consists of a number of contributions of considerably different content and quality. The first article, "Mykhailo Hrushevsky as Historian, Populist, and Statist" by N. Andrusiak, is intended as a general survey and points out the importance of Hrushevsky's achievement in the historical field. The author first describes the historian's strongly populist training under the Kiev professor Volodymyr Antonovych and repeats Hrushevsky's oft quoted confession as to his ultimate loyalties:

I was brought up in the strict tradition of Ukrainian radical populism, which originated with the Brotherhood of SS. Cyril and Methodius, and firmly believed that in the conflict between the people and the government, blame attaches to the government, since the interests of the working people are the highest good, and if they are flouted, the people are free to change their social system.⁸

The evidence for Hrushevsky's conversion to a more positive view of the state is presented somewhat less clearly. But the old professor's importance as a symbol of the cultural unity of Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia, and as a sympathetic mentor and correspondent of young scholars from both these areas, is documented by Andrusiak's own correspondence with the historian in the 1920s. Hrushevsky, it seems, always identified with the young; it was basic to his strategy never to be divorced from the main currents of social thought and political action espoused by the younger generation.

Because he was always surrounded by those younger than himself, Hrushevsky's character took on a patriarchal quality, which tended to reinforce his prestige within Ukrainian society as a whole. This served him well when it came to the difficult task of defining and defending the emerging Ukrainian standard literary language from the centrifugal forces of various regionalisms. In his contribution to Stakhiv's volume, P. Kovaliv discusses

⁸ M. Hrushevsky, "Ukrainska Partiia Sotsialistiv-Revolutsioneriv ta ii zavdannia," *Boritesia—Poborete* (Vienna), no. 1 (1920), p. 12; quoted by Andrusiak, p. 8.

Hrushevsky's role as an arbiter of language.⁹ Kovaliv notes that Hrushevsky's journalistic writings in Russian sought to create sympathy for the Ukrainian movement by pointing out the low educational level and literacy rate in Ukrainian-speaking areas relative to Russian-speaking ones. Hrushevsky maintained that the developing school system must make use of the native language if it is to solve the problem of illiteracy. But in his capacity as founder and editor of the prestigious "pan-Ukrainian" monthly *Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk*, Hrushevsky had the difficult task of balancing loyalty to the language spoken in various regions with the necessity for clear, generally accepted forms understood by all. Because of his fundamental loyalty to the popular masses, he underwent a complicated confusion of interests on this language issue.

The chains binding the Ukrainian language were abruptly snapped in 1917, and Hrushevsky was catapulted to the presidency of the new Ukrainian Republic. The revolution that had created this republic also unleashed a torrent of new social forces. In his public position at the head of the emerging governmental structure and through his numerous political pamphlets published at this time, Hrushevsky sought to channel the energy of the revolution in a creative direction. This effort is the main theme of V. Modrych-Verhan's analysis of Hrushevsky as journalist and propagandist.¹⁰

According to Modrych-Verhan, Hrushevsky's pamphlets of the revolutionary era were aimed largely at popularizing the Universals, or manifestoes, of the Central Rada. These tracts display most of the important ideas and political slogans of the Ukrainian revolution. A relatively peaceful transition to a new era of local self-government, personal and national liberty and equality, striking a balance among the various social classes, a new dignity bestowed upon the peasantry, and the relative unimportance of the bourgeoisie and proletariat (compared to their role in the modern history of Western Europe)—all of these ideas are found in Hrushevsky's writings. The slogans of autonomy, federation and local self-rule are repeated again and again. At the same time,

⁹ Although it is not mentioned anywhere in Stakhiv's volume, Kovaliv's "Mykhailo Hrushevsky u borotbi za ukrainsku movu," pp. 42-55, is a revised version of an essay that first appeared in Illia Borshchak's journal *Ukraina* (Paris), 1950, no. 3, pp. 150-5. On this same theme, see also M. Antonovych, "Do vzaiemny M. S. Hrushevskoho z S. O. Iefremovom," *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, 1975, nos. 1-2, pp. 91-9.

¹⁰ V. Modrych-Verhan, "Mykhailo Hrushevsky iak publitsyst," pp. 56-98.

claims Modrych-Verhan, Hrushevsky steered the thinking of his compatriots towards certain basic state concepts. These were the independence (*samostiinytstvo*), national unity (*sobornytstvo*) and sovereignty of the Ukrainian National Republic. The new “people’s state” was to be completely different from the bureaucratic police state of the past. It was to be free of the despotism of the church and the military; it was to be based primarily on the Ukrainian peasantry and their own free social organizations. “Where there are no formal organs [of police and bureaucracy],” wrote Hrushevsky, “it is obvious that society must take up this task itself. It does this in the interests of self-preservation and the security of the good for which it strives: civil liberty and democratic structure.”

For the inculcation of the idea of its statehood, American democracy does not command one of those organs about which I have just spoken. Obviously, this must also be the way of all-Ukrainian democracy. It must take upon itself the cause of strengthening the idea of Ukrainian democratic statehood, its spread throughout society, and the teaching of feelings of duty towards it as the highest stimulus towards social life. This must embrace the entire person and the entire nation (*narid*). In one impulse it must conquer party differences and divergences whenever the basic interest of the state is at stake.¹¹

These quoted passages, claims Modrych-Verhan, show that what Hrushevsky ultimately meant by Ukrainian democratic statehood was national independence in the conventional sense of the term. This is intended as a rejoinder to supporters of a sovereign Hetman state and to Hrushevsky’s conservative critics, who note that all of the Universals of the Central Rada made some reference to autonomy or federation and that Hrushevsky’s interest in a Slavic federation continued long after the fall of the Central Rada.¹²

In a similar vein, Modrych-Verhan deals with the question of Hrushevsky’s idealistic and professorial approach to military affairs. He concedes that Hrushevsky shared the disdain for a professional army that was then common among the intelligentsia

¹¹ M. Hrushevsky, “Pidstavy Velykoi Ukrainy,” from *Na porozi novoi Ukrainy* (Kiev, 1918); reprinted in *Vybrani pratsi*, ed. M. Halii (New York, 1960), pp. 102-3; quoted by Modrych-Verhan, p. 94.

¹² See n. 6 above and Hrushevsky’s own account of his negotiations with his old acquaintance, Thomas Masaryk, who had just become the new president of Czechoslovakia: “V pershii delegatsii Ukrainskoi Partii Sotsialistiv-Revoliutsioneriv,” *Vybrani pratsi*, pp. 159-62.

of the Russian Empire. But he also notes that the novice president had no illusions about any miracles that a non-professional but popular militia could achieve in the chaotic situation prevailing in 1917-8. "Among these dangers awaiting us on all sides," Hrushevsky wrote, "a militia will not secure us from [attempts at] taking advantage of our weakness, and for a time we need a small but good, hard, disciplined army."¹³ Thus, concludes Modrych-Verhan, Hrushevsky neither disbanded his army at the wrong moment nor revealed any mystical belief in the people to the detriment of state building. Whether in the political or in the purely scholarly arena, Hrushevsky's populism was realistic and well directed.

But Hrushevsky was more than just a radical politician or a *narodnyk* historian. His populism is also reflected in his literary criticism, his fiction and his work as a historian of literature. In a valuable contribution to Stakhiv's volume, Bohdan Romanenchuk discusses these themes and shows how Hrushevsky's early populism developed and matured into a philosophy of history and art that left behind the naive social realism of the late nineteenth century.¹⁴

Beginning with a social, utilitarian approach to literature, which was in accord with the theories of the Russian "revolutionary democrats" Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobroliubov, Hrushevsky's first publications, which took the form of short stories, were aimed at exposing the hypocrisy and oppression of official life. They breathe a special sympathy for the subject peoples of the world. Thus, in his very first publication, *Bek al Jugur* (1885), the future scholar dealt with the question of British imperial expansion in the Sudan. "I set forth in this tale all the liberation and anti-imperialist feelings of that time," he later explained. "I wrote as an Ukrainian patriot and an opponent of violence and the exploitation of the colonial peoples . . . I made fun of tottering morals and religious hypocrisy."¹⁵ But this was just the seed.

With professional training under Antonovych, and then experience in the cultural politics of Galicia and the revolutions of 1905-7 and 1917, Hrushevsky developed into a socialist who

¹³ See Modrych-Verhan, pp. 94-5.

¹⁴ Bohdan Romanenchuk, "Mykhailo Hrushevsky iak pysmennyk, literaturnyi krytyk ta istoryk literatury," pp. 21-41.

¹⁵ M. Hrushevsky, "Iak ia buv kolys beletystom," in his *Pid zoriamy* (Kiev, 1928); reprinted in *Vybrani pratsi*, pp. 170-7, and quoted by Romanenchuk, p. 22.

denied the cult of the individual. “He was not a Marxist,” explains Romanenchuk, “but only a populist.”

His social philosophy was formed to some degree under the influence of the French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), who did not recognize class struggle and Marxist internationalism with its class character and violent nature. In its place, he acknowledged the solidarity of antagonistic classes within the bounds of a community. He was a socialist in the sense that he put the individual within the bounds of a community—‘without which he could not exist.’ But he did not reduce the national community to inimical classes. His theory was contrary to radical individualism and the cult of the individual who put himself above society and his own individual interests above those of the community.¹⁶

One must also note, continues Romanenchuk, the general influence of the French theorist of literary positivism, Hippolyte Taine (1828-93), who saw literary creation as an expression of the “spirit of the times” and the milieus in which the writer lives and acts. At the same time, Hrushevsky rejected Taine’s idea about the importance of race. He came to prefer the more subtle approach of the German philosopher and historian Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1919), who pursued the “spirit of the times” not in abstract psychology, but only as it is found in concrete form in language, literature, art and science. Dilthey was, in essence, a sociologist. His influence on Hrushevsky was enormous and is shown in the many chapters of the *History of Ukraine-Rus*’ devoted to art, folklore and culture.

Years of study, collaboration and travel in western Europe with his good friend Ivan Franko¹⁷ and, especially, the traumatic

¹⁶ Romanenchuk, p. 27. Compare L. Bilas, “Geschichtsphilosophische und ideologische Voraussetzungen der geschichtlichen und politischen Konzeption M. Hruševskyjs,” *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 4 (1956), no. 3: 262-92. For Durkheim’s influence, see I. Vytanovych, “Uvahy do metodolohii istoriosofii M. Hrushevskoho,” *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, 1966, nos. 1-2, pp. 32-51, esp. pp. 49-51.

¹⁷ See Franko’s autobiographical account of his trip to Italy with “my dear friend, Professor Hrushevsky” (*mit meinem lieben Freunde, dem Prof. H.*). It is the story of two innocents out of the Galician *Urwald* come to discover a confusing civilization. See “Römische Eindrücke,” in E. Winter’s collection of the Franko German-language *corpus*: *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur der Ukraine* (Berlin, 1963), p. 64. The general question of the mutual influence of Franko and Hrushevsky remains unexplored. For an introduction to the problem, see V. Doroshenko, “Ivan Franko i Mykhailo Hrushevsky,” *Suchasnist*, 1962, no. 1, pp. 16-36.

experience of 1918 also had an effect upon Hrushevsky's notion of the fiction writer and the artist. Amidst the most turbulent times, with all their hopes and fears, Hrushevsky took consolation in reflections on eternity and the divine. The night sky inspired him. "The Latin phrase *sub divo*," he reminds us, "signifies 'under the sky': when a person sees himself before the visage of eternity or universal space, when all that limits and fences off a person from the various questions that they pose has fallen away." In this new consciousness, the purpose of the writer is to arouse a sympathetic response in others so as to be able to proceed together through eternity.¹⁸ Hrushevsky was moving away from "social realism."

The disenchantment of exile and the limitations of life under the Soviets had a further effect on the diminutive patriarch. When he returned to the same subject some ten years later, his theme was less optimistic: "Some people become more disturbed and others less . . ." he exclaimed,

But who can remain entirely free of his own damned accomodation to the taste, demands and opinions of others? Who can remain lord of himself and not give himself over to the people? The citizenry needs practical jokes for its own purposes. They provide amusement in order to flee the filth and injustice of life that threatens to inundate all. Thus, the artist is tempted by ambition, fame and coin. He is allured from generation to generation, and his convictions become coloured so that a man does not create for himself and his own feeling for beauty, but for people (*liudei*) and for fame. He creates in order to outdo other artists by his own efforts, to be above his contemporaries and enumerated in the ranks of his predecessors. To hell with the artist and his creation in this service to society that cuts him off from the abomination and emptiness of life!¹⁹

This is certainly not the unquestioning worship of the masses or of the messianic *intelligent* characteristic of Hrushevsky's early work. At any rate, it is not Belinsky's "social realism." Nor is it art for art's sake. Certainly, there is a correlation between the artist and society; but the artist must remain a free agent. Thus, concludes Romanenchuk, Hrushevsky, who remained a positivist when it came to scholarship or historical and social questions,

¹⁸ Romanenchuk, p. 23, citing the preface to the collection *Sub Divo*, published in 1918. The preface is dated 1917 and is reprinted in Hrushevsky's *Pid zoriamy*, p. 577. The author of this review had the pleasure of examining a copy of this very rare volume in the library of St. Andrew's College in Winnipeg.

¹⁹ Romanenchuk, p. 33, citing *Pid zoriamy*, pp. 354-5.

took a step towards idealist esthetics when he sat down to write. Naïve populism this is not.

In this last phase of his career, Hrushevsky once again was charged with an unrealistic approach to politics as well as naïve worship of the people. When the historian and first president of the Ukrainian Republic returned to Soviet Ukraine in 1924, the event was seen as a tragedy by most of the émigré press: it appeared to be a concession that further legitimated Soviet rule.²⁰ To some, Hrushevsky seemed to be a tired old warrior hurt by the personal squabbling of émigré life; thus, he was anxious to return to work on his *History of Ukraine-Rus'*.²¹ To others, he seemed to be seeking some kind of understanding with the Bolsheviks, as in those days, in the eyes of the Ukrainian left, they were still the least objectionable Russian power or party.²²

Matvii Stakhiv offers an alternative explanation. He compares Hrushevsky's return to Soviet Ukraine in 1924 with his return to Russian Ukraine in 1914. According to Stakhiv, Hrushevsky believed that a general war in Europe would bring the Romanov Tsardom to its knees. He wanted to be able to take advantage of this situation when it occurred, and therefore he returned to Kiev from Galicia via neutral Italy and Romania. Similarly, in 1924 Hrushevsky predicted that another global conflict was not far off. Once again, he expected war and revolution to engulf Russia. Thus, he returned to prepare the ground and to be present when the opportunity to strike back presented itself. There was no question of accommodation or compromise with the enemy.²³

Stakhiv provides his own testimony in support of this argument. He relates that Hrushevsky was extremely critical of Volodymyr Vynnychenko, the Ukrainian Social Democratic leader, for his fruitless trip to Moscow and Kharkiv in 1920. Vynnychenko had hoped to bargain with Moscow over the question of Ukrainian independence. Hrushevsky argued that hard experience had al-

²⁰ See, for example, the stinging sarcasm of his fellow SR, M. Shapoval, "Emigratsiia i Ukraina," *Nova Ukraina* 4, nos. 4-5 (1925): 1-17.

²¹ Borys Martos, "M. S. Hrushevsky iakym ia ioho znav," *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, 1966, nos. 1-2, pp. 73-81.

²² V. Doroshenko, "Zhyttia i diialnist M. Hrushevskoho," in *Vybrani pratsi*, pp. 24-5.

²³ M. Stakhiv, "Chomu M. Hrushevsky povernusia v 1924 rotsi do Kyieva? Zhmut faktiv i uryvok zi spohadiv," pp. 109-47. See also the evidence collected by L. Vynar, which qualifies this view somewhat: "Chomu M. Hrushevsky povernusia na Ukrainu v 1924 rotsi," *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, 1967, nos. 3-4, pp. 103-8.

ready shown that if they had neither an army at their back nor a Great Power to aid them, the Ukrainians could expect no concessions from the Bolsheviks.

Using the Vynnychenko episode as an introduction, Stakhiv relates how the Ukrainian emigration was shaken by rumors of Hrushevsky's possible return to Kiev. The large Ukrainian community in Prague resolved to convince the historian that this would be a grave mistake, a severe blow to the government of the Ukrainian National Republic in exile, and an act of reconciliation with the foreign occupier. It sent Stakhiv, then a young student activist and one of the few Ukrainian public figures with whom Hrushevsky was still on good terms, to Vienna to offer the historian a number of important academic posts in Prague. It was hoped that strong political arguments, the opportunity to carry on with his research, and material security in a cosmopolitan European city would persuade Hrushevsky to change his mind.

It did not work. Stakhiv and Hrushevsky discussed the political consequences of a return to Ukraine; the latter argued that it was only there that he could find the materials to continue his *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. When Stakhiv pressed him further, Hrushevsky confided that he believed that a new revolution was in the offing, and that the New Economic Policy (NEP) and the new and more liberal Communist national policies were signs that Lenin and the Politburo knew that something was about to happen. He claimed that he had foreseen the revolution of 1917, and that Communist agitation in Asia and Africa, together with British fears of Russian expansion, would soon bring about another World War. The issue was still unresolved when Stakhiv left for Prague, but Hrushevsky had shown signs of coming over to his point of view. Thus, it was "thunder out of a clear sky" when, a couple of months later, Stakhiv received a letter from Hrushevsky informing him of his decision to return to Kiev. The die was cast.

Stakhiv also produces documentary evidence to bolster his argument. He prints letters from Hrushevsky to Ukrainians in the United States and Canada revealing an uncompromising opposition to Soviet rule. In a letter to the Ukrainian Red Cross in Canada, dated December 1922, Hrushevsky plainly refers to the Bolshevik occupation of Ukraine.²⁴ This is hardly the language of a Communist sympathizer.

In further chapters, Stakhiv discusses the Communist Party's

²⁴ M. Stakhiv, "Deiaki dokumenty pro diialnist Hrushevskoho na emigratsii," p. 159.

offensive against Hrushevsky and the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The beginning of the 1930s saw an open attack on the Academy and especially on Hrushevsky's colleagues and students. In March 1931, Hrushevsky was compelled to move to Moscow, never to return to Ukraine; this second exile ended in 1934 with his mysterious death in Kislovodsk while on vacation, following two routine operations on a spinal infection.²⁵ Stakhiv then examines Soviet textbook treatment of Hrushevsky and the attempted "rehabilitation" of him in the mid-1960s. The latter phenomenon was a part of the brief cultural revival (1963-72) that occurred under the protection of Petro Shelest, the First Secretary of the CPU during that period.²⁶ Stakhiv summarizes the difficulties that the Soviet Ukrainian intelligentsia had in explaining away the historian's uncompromising attitude towards Marxism; he notes the embarrassment his own testimony had already caused to Hrushevsky's faltering Soviet protagonists.²⁷ All in all, Stakhiv's point is well made.

Hrushevsky was always a democrat. In his later years, he called himself a socialist and made good use of modern sociological concepts. Yet, it is clear that Marxism never held an attraction for him. Nevertheless, the basic problem of the nature of Hrushevsky's populism remains. His essential formation and his polemics in 1905 and 1917 reveal the depth of his commitment to the people and his mistrust of the state. The desire for a federal tie comes up again and again: if not with Lithuania and Belorussia, then with democratic Russia; if not with revolutionary Russia, then with the countries of the Black Sea region.²⁸ Yet,

²⁵ H. Kostiuk, "The last days of Academician M. Hrushevsky," *Ukrainian Review* (Munich) 5 (1957): 73-83; N. Polonska-Vasylchenko, "Istorychna nauka v Ukrainsi za sovetskoi doby ta dolia istorykiv," *Zbirnyk na poshanu ukrainskykh uchenykh znyshchenykh bolshevycskoiu Moskvoiu*, ed. M. Ovcharenko, *Zapysky NTSh* 173 (1962): 7-111.

²⁶ The most subtle thaw in the Soviet attitude towards Hrushevsky was picked up immediately and commented on in the West. See J. Pełenski, "Soviet Ukrainian Historiography after World War II," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 12 (1964): 375-418, esp. p. 44, and his later "Shelest and His Period in Soviet Ukraine, 1963-1972: A Revival of Controlled Ukrainian Autonomism," in *Ukraine in the Seventies*, ed. P. Potichnyj (Oakville, Ont., 1975), pp. 283-305.

²⁷ M. Stakhiv, "Deiaki materialy pro bolshevycskyi nastup na Hrushevskoho," pp. 175-220.

²⁸ M. Hrushevsky, "Orientaltsiia chornomorska," in *Vybrani pratsi*, pp. 65-8; O. Ohloblyn, "Mykhailo Serhiievych Hrushevsky," *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, 1966, nos. 1-2, pp. 6-14.

the same man who so extolled federalism and the *narid* also declared himself for independence when, together with Ivan Franko, he organized the Ukrainian National Democratic Party in Galicia, and in 1918, when he thought a sovereign Ukraine compatible with federalism. His contemporaries explained this divergence as a kind of honorable opportunism.²⁹ The next generation, the partisans of “integral” nationalism, characterized it as equivocation and the betrayal of the national cause.³⁰ Stakhiv’s volume is directed against such allegations, and we may agree with him in saying that Hrushevsky’s respect for the state and, in particular, the liberal views of Drahomanov increased with the years. After his return to Kiev in 1924, in spite of the prevailing political and national oppression, the old historian still felt himself “within the Ukrainian Republic that we began to build in 1917.”³¹ But this does not prove that Hrushevsky completely discarded his old populist-SR world view. The problem of federalism and the nature of his commitment to the *narid* remains.

From the 1930s through to the end of the Cold War, it was fashionable for historians writing in English to translate *Ukrainska Narodnia Respublika* as the “Ukrainian National Republic.” If I am not mistaken, there is a recent trend toward amending this translation to “Ukrainian People’s Republic.” Perhaps this basic difficulty with the original meaning of the adjective *narodnia* is somewhat analogous to the debate over Hrushevsky’s historical role. If it is, then the entire debate tells us as much about the violent history of our own century as it does about the conscientious historian who was born in 1866.

²⁹ See, for example, V. Levynsky, *Tsarska Rosiia i ukrainska sprava* (Montreal, 1917), pp. 105-10, and the memoir of O. Shulhyn, “Mykhailo Serhiievych Hrushevsky iak polityk i liudyna,” in *Zbirnyk na poshanu Oleksandra Shulhyna (1889-1960)*, ed. V. Ianiv, *Zapysky NTSh* 186 (1969): 143-55.

³⁰ See M. Mukhyn, “Prof. Hrushevsky (1866-1934),” *Vistnyk* 4 (1936), no. 2, pp. 102-15; no. 3, pp. 194-202; no. 4, pp. 268-77 for a heady approach that includes the typical accusation of *moskvofilstvo*. Hrushevsky was furious at the capture of *Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk* by Dmytro Dontsov and the “integral” nationalists, and considered it the corruption of what had been a democratic national institution. See the remarks of V. Doroshenko, “‘Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk,’ *Literaturno-Naukovyi Visnyk* (Regensburg) 1 (1948): 53.

³¹ “Lysty M. Hrushevskoho do T. Pochynka,” ed. M. Antonovych, *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, 1970, nos. 1-3, pp. 178-83. See also the editorial statement in *Ukraina*, 1924, no. 4, p. 190, which discusses the possibility of fruitful scholarly work “in our own home, in the Ukrainian Republic.”

Микола Мушинка

ЧИ ІЦЕ ІКОНИ: СЛОВАЦЬКІ, КАРПАТСЬКІ, КОСТЕЛЬНІ ЧИ УКРАЇНСЬКІ? *

Одним з найбільших здобутків словацького мистецтвознавства останніх 15 років є відкриття у північно-східній Словаччині ікон, як самобутнього прояву мистецтва найширших народних мас. Як дійшло до такого відкриття?

Ця область, заселена в основному українським населенням, відзначається значною кількістю дерев'яних церков, які здавна привертали увагу дослідників. 27 з них уряд Словаччини 1968 р. оголосив національними культурними пам'ятниками, взявши на себе отаким чином усі витрати пов'язані з їх утримуванням і збереженням для майбутніх поколінь. Та виявилось, що дерев'яні церкви цікаві не лише своєю архітектурою, але й внутрішнім устаткуванням, перш за все іконами. Із другої половини 60-их років розпочалась хвиля захоплення іконами, на які до того часу майже ніхто не звертав уваги: музеї та галерії почали зосереджувати ікони у великій кількості. Багато уваги приділялось їх реставрації, в чому заслужилися зокрема реставратори Братіслави. Частину ікон реставровано у Кракові.

В 1968 р. Словацька національна галерія в Братіславі з великим успіхом влаштувала виставку „Ікони на Словаччині”. Подібні виставки були влаштовані в Бардіївських Купелях, Пряшеві, Мартіні, Празі та інших містах Чехословаччини. На всіх цих виставках ікони були представлені за територіальним принципом як „ікони Словаччини”, причому факт, що вони походять з українських сіл Словаччини послідовно замовчувався і замовчується й досі. Не дивно, що „ікони Словаччини” у пресі, радіо та телебаченні трактуються

* З приводу видання книги Štefan Tkáč, *Ikony zo 16.-17. storočia na severovýchodnom Slovensku. Fotografie Miroslav Jurík*. Bratislava: Tatran, 1980.

як „словацькі ікони”. Подібним способом трактують ікони і каталоги до окремих виставок,¹ монографія А. Фріцького „Ікони зі східної Словаччини”² та численні розвідки в науковій і науково-популярній пресі.

В березні 1970 р. Чехословацька пошта з нагоди світової виставки „Експо 70” у японському місті Осака випустила спеціальну поштову марку із зображенням ікони 17 ст. тиражем 598.000 примірників.³ Серед філателістів марка викликала справжню сенсацію, тому наприкінці того ж року випущено вже серію чотирьох марок „Slovenské ľudové ikony” („Словацькі народні ікони”) загальним тиражем два мільйони 528 тисяч примірників.⁴ Всі без винятку „словацькі ікони” на поштових марках походять з українських сіл, однак про їх відношення до української культури в теперішній пресі не було найменшої згадки.

Терміни „словацька ікона”, „східнословакська ікона” дуже швидко переросли рамки Словаччини, зокрема після успішних виставок „словацьких ікон” у Японії, США, Канаді, Франції, Бельгії, Австрії та інших країнах. На жодній з цих виставок не було й натяку про справжнє етнічне походження цих визначних мистецьких творів; ікони скрізь трактовано як шедеври словацького мистецтва. Найменшої згадки про їх справжнє національне обличчя нема навіть у такому поважному довіднику, як „Енциклопедія Словаччини”. Гасло „Ікона” в ній ілюстроване п’ятьома репродукціями ікон. Усі вони походять з українських сіл східної Словаччини, однак в довідці цього факту навіть не згадано, а про походження „східнословакських” ікон написано, що їх принесли на Словаччину „волоські колоністи у 14-17 ст.”.⁵

В 1968-9 рр. були несміливі спроби українців виступати проти такого трактування ікон. Газета „Нове життя” 1968 р. опублікувала полемічну статтю „Словацькі ікони?” з приводу братиславської виставки.⁶ Найстарший чеський україніст, особистий друг І. Франка, В. Гнатюка, М. Павлика та ін.,

¹ Š. Tkáč, *Ikony na Slovensku* (Bratislava, 1968); A. Frický, *Ikony z východného Slovenska* (Bardejov, 1968); Š. Tkáč, *Ikonen der Ostslowakei* (Praha, 1969); Š. Tkáč, *Ikônes Slovaques* (Brussels, 1973).

² A. Frický, *Ikony z východného Slovenska* (Kosice, 1971).

³ Československo. *Katalog poštovních známk 1945-1979* (Praha, 1980), стор. 300.

⁴ Там же, стор. 309-10.

⁵ *Encyklopédia Slovenska*, zv. II (Bratislava, 1978), стор. 431.

⁶ М. Мушинка, „Словацькі ікони?”, *Нове життя*, 1968, № 24.

Ф. Главачек написав у цій справі кілька протестних листів різним офіційним установам та особам, навіть визначному політичному та культурному діячеві — голові Матиці словацької Л. Новоместському. Ці заходи однак не принесли жодних позитивних результатів і дуже швидко припинилися. В сучасності ніхто і не подумає протестувати проти неправильного національного трактування ікон з території східної Словаччини.

Наприкінці 60-их років Свидницький музей української культури, заохочений загальною популярністю ікон у світі, у своїй експозиції „Духовна культура українців Чехословаччини” присвятив іконам окрему залю. На початку 70-их років ікони даної експозиції було замінено виробами промислових видів і підприємств східної Словаччини. Натомість влітку 1980 р. у Бардіївських Купелях було відкрито постійну виставку „східнословакських ікон”. І на цій виставці всі без винятку ікони походять з українських сіл; однак цього факту і на цей раз ніде не зазначено.

Кількість публікацій про ікони північно-східної Словаччини (включно журнальних статей) опублікованих словацькою та чеською мовами за останніх п'ятнадцять років перевищує п'ять десятків, однак у жодній з них не зазначено навіть такого елементарного факту, що досліджувані ікони походять з українських сіл.

Розгляньмо, як представлена ця справа у найновішій і найвизначнішій публікації „Ікони 16-19 ст. на північно-східній Словаччині” Ш. Ткача, яку наприкінці 1980 р. видало братіславське видавництво „Татран”.

По суті це досконало підготовлений альбом, що охоплює схематичну карту території розповсюдження ікон, 272 репродукції ікон, в тому числі 72 кольорові, високої технічної й художньої якості. Майже кожна ікона представлена у повному вигляді та в ряді детальних вирізів, так що глядач має змогу побачити її нюанси, часто не помітні навіть на оригіналі ікони. Доожної репродукції подано чотирохмовну (словаксько-російсько-англійсько-німецьку) паспортизацію із зазначенням місця походження ікони, часу її виникнення, розмірів, місця сучасного її зберігання, з поясненням картинок на клеймах ікони тощо (стор. 225-56).

Книга відкривається грунтовною вступною статтею (стор. 7-78), в якій автор намагається наблизити ікону сучасному читачеві, в переважній більшості не обізнаному з канонами християнської релігії. Майже кожну ікону автор піддає окремій аналізі, розкриваючи її походження та пояснюючи її

зміст їй окремі символи. Щоб читач мав повне уявлення про описувану ікону, безпосередньо в тексті або на полях опису подано її мініятурну репродукцію з зазначенням порядкового номера її великої чорно-білої чи кольорової репродукції. Отже кожна із досліджуваних ікон представлена у двох репродукціях — великій і малій, однак, цей „дубляж” є на користь справи. Аналізу ікон подано на фоні історичного розвитку даного регіону. Автор часто порівнює ікони південносхідної Словаччини з аналогічними картинами інших областей.

Стисле резюме вступної статті подано російською, англійською та німецькою мовами (стор. 267-76), що дозволяє користатися публікацією і широкому колові закордонних спеціалістів.

Рядовим читачам у добрій пригоді стане словник мистецьких та церковних термінів (стор. 258-60), а спеціалістам — список використаної літератури (стор. 261-65).

Ціла публікація надрукована на крейдяному папері і з поліграфічної точки зору витримає порівняння з кращими публікаціями світового мистецтва.

Нас найбільше цікавить вступна стаття Ш. Ткача, присвячена характеристиці та аналізі ікон південно-східної Словаччини. У своїй першій книзі про ікони, „Ikony na Slovensku”, виданій з приводу братіславської виставки ікон 1968 р., Ш. Ткач писав: „Дослідження в цій області розпочалось у нас лише в останньому часі і на сучасному етапі ще не дозволяє нам вповні ясно бачити генезу розвитку іконописної творчості”.⁷ Відповідь на питання, як автор бачить генезу розвитку іконописної творчості у північносхідній Словаччині після 12 років, дає його остання публікація.

За генетичним принципом автор розподілив ікони на дві групи: до першої він залучив ікони 16 ст., до другої — ікони 17-19 ст. Ікони першої групи були творені під значним впливом візантійської культури; на іконах другої групи помітний вплив католицизму.

Чимало уваги автор присвятив історичному розвиткові досліджуваного регіону, церковній історії, іконописним централам, що постачали ікони на східну Словаччину, іконописним майстерням, маліарській техніці та технології живопису тощо.

Найбільша цінність публікації полягає в детальній аналізі кожної ікони. Зміст ікон автор пояснює на основі Біблії,

⁷ Š. Tkáč, *Ikony na Slovensku* (Bratislava, 1968). Сторінки статті, публіковані словацькою, німецькою та французькою мовами — не нумеровані. Ця цитата, як усі наступні, перекладена мною (М.М.).

житті святих та іншої літератури, зокрема мітологічної. Часто він посилається й на нехристиянські релігії, які впливали на християнство. На відміну від інших сучасних дослідників, зокрема східнослов'янських, Ш. Ткач не намагається спротивувати релігійні догми, а переносить сучасного читача у внутрішній світ середньовічних творців і консументів іконо-писної традиції.

А як же він трактує національну чи етнічну специфіку ікон північно-східної Словаччини?

Основна „новина” полягає в тому, що автор відступив від трактування ікон даної області, як складової частини словацької культури, а залучає їх до ширшого контексту т. зв. „карпатської області”, під якою розуміє карпатську зону України, Польщі, Словаччини та Румунії. Отже ікона, на думку автора, є спільним маєтком усіх національностей та етнічних груп, що заселяють цей регіон.

Обґрунтовуючи отакий вихідний пункт, Ш. Ткач пише: „Не зважаючи на те, що я виходжу з територіяльного розуміння „ікони Словаччини” та намагаюся оцінювати окремі твори з точки зору їх виникнення — оскільки вони були призначенні або замовлені для території Словаччини — все ж таки тут я аплікую ширші міжнародні художньо-географічні аспекти та застосовую ширше об'єднувальне поняття „карпатська область”” (стор. 10).

Треба сказати, що такий принцип, на перший погляд, не позбавлений внутрішньої логіки: таж існує „карпатський тип” житлового будинку, „карпатський цикл народних мелодій”, „карпатський спосіб вівчарства”, „карпатський опришківський фолклор” тощо; чому б не міг існувати і „карпатський іконо-пис”, як спільне майно всіх народів та етнічних груп, що заселяють карпатську область?

Та все ж таки тут існує суттєва різниця.

1. Справа в тому, що „карпатським типом” житлового будинку в однаковій мірі користуються і словаки, і поляки, і українці; „карпатський цикл” народних пісень в однаковій мірі співають і словаки, і поляки, і українці; „карпатський спосіб вівчарства” практикують і словаки, і поляки, і українці. Але ж іконами ні словаки, ні поляки карпатського регіону не користувалися. І на території Польщі, і на території Словаччини ікона була майже виключною доменою українців.

2. Жоден дослідник не буде вагатися залучити „карпатський тип” житлового будинку з українських місцевостей до української культури, з польських — до польської, зі сло-

вацьких — до словацької, без огляду на адміністративні чи державні кордони. Те саме стосується „карпатських мелодій”, „карпатського вівчарства”, „карпатського опришківського фолклору” тощо. Так чому ж за таким принципом не залучити до української культури і ікони з українських поселень східної Словаччини?

Будучи свідомим такої небезпеки, автор в розділі „Характеристика етносу” (стор. 15) намагається переконати читача в тому, що область наявності ікон — південно-східня Словаччина — з етнічного погляду є настільки складною, що застосування етнічного принципу при досліджуванні ікон є неможливим. Спираючись на історичні джерела, він пише про колонізацію цієї області німцями, угорцями, румунами, сербами, болгарами, і ніби лише мимохідь, посилаючись на словацького історика Б. Варсіка, він згадує переселення туди „русинів” під час т. зв. „волоської колонізації” 14-16 ст.⁸ Проте, що русини жили на території східної Словаччини і до „волоської колонізації”, нема тут найменшої згадки. В дійсності колонізація німців, угорців, сербів, болгарів та румунів на територію північно-східної Словаччини була настільки незначною, що за винятком міст не залишила тут жодного сліду. Не було й немає тут ні одного німецького, угорського, сербського, болгарського чи румунського села, а були і є лише словацькі й українські поселення. Отже на фоні цього факту тези Ш. Ткача про „різноманітну етнічно-національну структуру населення”, про „надзвичайно складну етнічну ситуацію” (стор. 16) та „етнічно неоднорідне населення” (стор. 15), з-за яких ніби не можна визначити національний характер ікон північно-східної Словаччини, виявляються безпідставними.

Напрошується питання: якщо північно-східню Словаччину заселяють лише дві національності — словаці й українці — то котрій з них належать ікони? Такого питання автор навіть не поставив. Більше того: крім вище наведеної цитати про „валаську колонізацію”, він у цілій публікації ні разу не згадав про те, що в цій області карпатського регіону живуть теж українці.

⁸ В англійському резюме про це читаемо: “In East Slovakia this was represented by the typical area of great ‘Walachian colonisation.’ The immigrants arriving in the border and peripheral regions of East Slovakia originally adhered mostly to the Eastern, Orthodox church and nationally belonged to several ethnic groups. In the new environment they got varied names: the Walachs or Ruthens (Russins, Rusnacks).” Стор. 270.

Говорячи про мовне питання в області наявності ікон, тобто в північно-східній Словаччині, він пише: „В цих областях розмовною мовою залишилась словацька мова. Згідно з лексіконом 1773 р. тоді переважно по-словакськи говорили не лише в Трочанах, але в цілому Шариші” (стор. 15).

З такої заяви, підкресленої посиланням на важливий історичний документ, необізнаний читач може зробити лише один висновок: ікони східної Словаччини, що за географічним принципом належать до карпатської області, за національним принципом є складовою частиною словацької культури. Правда, сам автор послідовно стримується від такої заяви, а говорить лише про „наші” ікони. Вже у першому абзаці вступу він недвозначно заявляє, що ікони північно-східної Словаччини разом з дерев’яними церквами є „визначним комплексом нашого пам’яткового багатства” (стор. 9). Сумнівається, щоб під поняттям „наше багатство” він мав на увазі географічний принцип.

Та врешті решт чи єм національним багатством є ікони? Розгляньмо це питання на підставі джерельних аргументів самого автора.

На фронтиспісі книги Ш. Ткач навів „Карту населених пунктів карпатської області з наявністю ікон”. Карта далеко не повна, та все ж таки нехай вона послужить для нас вихідним пунктом. На ній зазначено 31 село східної Словаччини, де в сучасності знаходяться ікони на своєму первісному місці, тобто у церквах,⁹ та п’ять міст, в яких ікони зберігаються в музеях.¹⁰ В цитованому „Лексиконі” 1773 р. словацька розмовна мова наведена у трьох із наведених сіл: Трочани, Кожани та Новоселиця, причому в останніх двох ідеться про явну помилку: ні в Новоселиці, ні в Кожанах словаки ніколи не жили. Два села (Боглярка, Курів) наведені як словацько-руські (Slavo-Ruthenica). Сьогодні і вони є українськими. У всіх інших, тобто 26 селах з наявністю ікон, розмовною мовою наведена руська (Ruthenica).¹¹ На етнографічних картах С.

⁹ Боглярка, Бодружаль, Брежани, Венеція-Луків, Вишній Орлик, Вишня Ялова, Гунківці, Доброслава, Дубова, Збій, Іновець, Кальна Розтока, Кожани, Красний Брід, Криве, Курів, Ладомирова, Матисова, Микулашова (Никльова), Мироля, Нижня Ялова, Новоселиця, Потоки, Прикра, Руська Бистра, Трочани, Улич-Криве, Фричка, Шашова та Шеметківці.

¹⁰ Бардіїв, Гуменне, Михалівці, Снина, Стара Любовня.

¹¹ *Národopisná mapa Uher podle úředního lexikonu osad z roku 1773, sestavil Prof. A. Petrov (Praha, 1924).*

Томашівського 1910 р.¹² і Я. Гуска 1925 р.¹³ та інших, всі ці села, з винятком Трочан, зазначені як руські, тобто українські. Українську говірку наводить в цих селах і найновіший діалектологічний атлас Словаччини, виданий Словацькою академією наук.¹⁴

Отже, як бачимо, твердження Ш. Ткача про „різноманітну етнічно-національну структуру” населення південно-східньої Словаччини не відповідає дійсності, а посилання на лексикон 1773 р. є явною фальсифікацією історичного джерела. Якщо ікони походять виключно з українських сіл, то вони аж ніяк не можуть бути словацькими.¹⁵

Розглядаючи окремі ікони, автор часто порівнює їх з „польськими” іконами, причому ні в одному випадку не зазначує, що й на території Польщі ікона була виключною доменою українського населення. Тут не хочемо обвинувачувати лише автора, бо він виходить з польських дослідників Я. Клосінської, Є. Петрусінського, Я. Новацької та інших, які трактують ікони на території Польщі теж за географічним, а не за національним принципом.

Автор часто підкреслює орієнтацію православної Церкви східної Словаччини на „польський Пшемисль”, „польський Санок”, „польський Риботич”, причому оминає факт, що ця орієнтація була спрямована на українські релігійні осередки цих міст.

Намагання автора довести словацько-польські взаємини в області іконописної творчості приводить його до явних парадоксів. Наприклад, розглядаючи ікону „Розп’яття” з Трочан, він пише: „На іконі знаходяться й писані тексти, з яких виходить, що цю ікону 23. 2. 1634 р. дарував священик Теодор Томеш костьолу Покров у польському Ржешові. Характерно, що мовні елементи в цій присвяті є не лише польські, але деякі й словацькі, що дозволяє льокалізувати ікону на територію східної Словаччини, куди вона врешті-решт невідомим способом потрапила” (стор. 66). На щастя, згадувану присвяту можна прочитати з поданої репродукції. Щоб читач сам міг оцінити „польські” та „словашькі” елементи в цій

¹² С. Томашівський, Етнографічна карта Угорської Русі, “Сборник по славяноведению” (Санкт-Петербург), т. 93 (1910).

¹³ J. Husek, Národopisná hranice mezi Slováky a Karpatorusy. Knižnica “Prúdy” č. 2 (Bratislava, 1925).

¹⁴ Atlas slovenského jazyka, d. I (Bratislava, 1968).

¹⁵ Українським селом первісно були і Трочани, однак будучи в повному словацькому оточенні вони пословачились вже до 1773 р.

присвяті, наведемо її повністю в сучасній транскрипції з церковнослов'янського тексту: „Сей образ купил аз многогрішный раб Божій Федор Томеш сященик ряшовський, старого попа Івана Томеша внука за свое здоров'я, а за отпущеніс гріхов родичов своїх, до церкви ряшовской ку храму Покров Пресвятої Богородиці, року Божого 1634, місяця января, дня 23” (стор. 159). Вже на перший погляд можна бачити, що тут нема ні польських, ні словацьких мовних елементів. Це лемківська говорка української мови. Дані ікона не має нічого спільногого з „польським Ржешовом”, а походить з українського села Ряшів, на Бардіївщині, недалеко с. Трочани, куди вона пізніше потрапила.

Здається, що автор перебільшив вплив Балкану на розвиток ікон, виходячи з неправильного розуміння суті „волоської колонізації”.¹⁶ На його думку, „безпосередній вплив з Болгарії та Сербії через угорську та трансильванську територію був набагато природнішим, ніж вплив з Києва”. Натомість він підкреслює, що на східній Словаччині „Крім Балкану часті стосунки були нав'язувані з російськими містами, зокрема з найбільшим художнім центром давньої Росії Новгородом” (стор. 23). Напрошується питання: як могла східня Словаччина нав'язувати інтенсивні стосунки з російськими містами, оминаючи Україну? Якщо з далеким Новгородом стосунки були частими, то з набагато більшим Києвом, якому до запровадження унії з Римом була підпорядкована і православна Церква в Карпатах, мусили бути не менш частими. Що це було і справді так, свідчать церковні книги з України, яких у православних церквах східної Словаччини було набагато більше, ніж книжок з Балкану.¹⁷

Незважаючи на факт, що автор наприкінці своєї праці подає досить обширний список використаної літератури (152 позицій), українська іконографічна література представлена в ньому (в дуже спотвореній транслітерації) лише 6-томною „Історією українського мистецтва” та деякими (не завжди найліпшими) працями українських дослідників (Д. Антоновича, В. Гаджеги, К. Заклинського, І. Запаска, І. Крип'якевича, В. Кубійовича, В. Лакати, Г. Логвина, В. Січинського, В.

¹⁶ Під терміном “волов”, “валах” у зв’язку з “волоською” колонізацією карпатського регіону треба розуміти не “румунів”, а “пастухів”, які на східній Словаччині були майже виключно українського походження.

¹⁷ І. Панькевич, “Матеріали до історії мови південно-карпатських українців”, *Науковий збірник Музею української культури у Свиднику*, № 4, кн. 2 (Пряшів, 1970).

Свенціцької, І. Свенціцького та В. Яреми). В самій публікації ці праці майже не використані. А в українській іконографічній літературі він би знайшов куди більше спільних моментів, ніж у балканській чи польській.

Щоб рецензованою книгою міг користатися і закордонний читач, список з короткою характеристикою всіх ікон, як і резюме, подано російською, англійською та німецькою мовами. Як відомо, східнослов'янські мови, як і польська та північнослов'янські, точно розрізняють терміни „церква” („церковь”) та „костел” („костъол”), тому зовсім незрозуміло, чому автор в російському тексті послідовно вживав термін „костел” на означення церков східного обряду (православних та греко-католицьких) в східній Словаччині. Термін „костел” вжито майже сто разів, причому ні одного разу біля нього не поставлено пояснювальний прикметник, з якого читач би міг довідатися, що йдеться про „православний костел”. Випадок? Прикра помилка перекладача? Може й так. Але ж не віриться, щоб автор — спеціяліст по іконографії — не зінав, що значить термін „костел” в російській мові. Чи може саме тим він хотів підкреслити відмінність „східнослов'янських ікон з костелів” від „східнослов'янських ікон з церков”? Необізаний читач, читуючи про „ікони з костелів”, вже зовсім не буде сумніватися, що мова йде про „словашкі ікони”. Отже, на перший погляд така незначна помилка може спричинитися до зовсім спотвореного трактування не лише національної, але й релігійної специфіки ікони. А може саме про це і йшлося авторові?

Ми є глибоко вдячні авторові та іншим словацьким дослідникам за їх увагу до ікон східної Словаччини, без якої ці шедеври народного мистецтва може б і досьогодні залишилися невідомими поза межами місцевого населення, а деякі з них би назавжди пропали, як пропали сотні інших ікон. Та все ж таки гадаємо, що замовчування такого важливого фактора, як національна специфіка ікон, суперечить основним етичним нормам наукового дослідження.

Підсумовуючи сказане вище, підкреслюємо, що ми зовсім не є проти застосування географічного принципу при аналізі ікон, згідно з яким ікони північно-східної Словаччини належать до карпатської обласної групи іконопису. Вимагаємо лише, щоб цей принцип був застосований у повній мірі. А при повному застосуванні географічного принципу книга ІІІ. Ткача би мала називатися „Ікони 16-19 ст. в українських селах північно-східної Словаччини”, бо лише така назва відповідає дійсності.

Отже, вірне застосування географічного принципу дуже просто вирішить і національну та етнічну специфіку ікон північно-східної Словаччини, яка авторові здається надзвичайно складною.

Одночасно пропонуємо українським мистецтвознавцям глибше займатися дослідженням даної проблематики.

GUIDE TO RESEARCH

THE HOOVER INSTITUTION ON WAR,
REVOLUTION AND PEACE:
ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Introduction

Since its founding in 1919, the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace has developed into a world renowned centre for research and documentation on the causes and consequences of political, military, economic and social change in the twentieth century. This intellectual focus has been reflected in many ways, especially by the Hoover Institution's publications programme. It alone has been responsible for over 350 volumes since the Hoover Institution's formation.¹

The Hoover Institution consists of a specialized library and archival depository, and a centre devoted to advanced interdisciplinary study. It is centrally located on the campus of Stanford University, California, in the Hoover Tower and the Lou Henry Hoover Memorial buildings.² The library has six principal area collections: North America, Central and Western Europe, Latin America, East Asia, Africa and the Middle East, and Russia/Soviet Europe and Eastern Europe. It contains approximately 1.5 million volumes, some 25,000 periodical titles, and files of approximately 6,000 newspapers.³ In addition, the Hoover Institution is the largest private

¹ Some of the recent works include Alan W. Fisher, *The Crimean Tatars* (1978); Peter Kenez, *Civil War in South Russia, 1919-1920: The Defeat of the Whites* (1977); Borys Levytsky, comp., *The Stalinist Terror in the Thirties: Documentation from the Soviet Press* (1974); and James M. Rhodes, *The Hitler Movement: A Modern Millenarian Revolution* (1980).

² For more information, see *Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace: Report, 1979* (Stanford, Cal., 1979).

³ See the Institution's booklet, *Russian and East European Collection* (1980), p. 1.

archival repository in North America. Its holdings of nearly 4,000 collections (some 950 dealing specifically with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union) of personal papers and organization records include many unique and prized materials, a few of which will be mentioned below.

The importance of the Hoover Institution is obvious. What is less explicable is why so few people currently engaged in studies pertaining to Ukraine or Ukrainians in the diaspora have failed to make use of it.

Origin and Scope of the Collections

In 1919, on Herbert Hoover's initiative, Professor E. D. Adams of the History Department at Stanford University journeyed to Paris to gather material on the Great War and the subsequent Peace Conference. Simultaneously, Dr. Adams took it upon himself to contact all of the East-European delegations at the conference, including both those representing existing states and those with claims to statehood. Ukrainian materials thus came to be included in the Hoover Institution's earliest records.

Afterwards archival materials were gathered by a number of other scholars. For example, in September 1920, Professor Frank Golder travelled to Eastern Europe as a roving acquisitions agent. Working with the American Relief Administration to Soviet Russia, Dr. Golder acquired over 40,000 valuable items, thus further developing the growing foundation of the Hoover War Library (as it was then called).

Area specialists were appointed as curators of regional collections quite early in the Hoover Institution's history. In 1924, Dmitry M. Krassovsky was appointed the first curator of the Russian and East-European collection. At the same time former General N. N. Golovine became acquisitions agent in Europe.

During the past six decades this collection has been systematically expanded. Gaps that emerged during strained periods in the history of the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe (e.g., World War II and the late Stalin period) were partially filled in with original materials and microfilms. Since the last survey of the Russian and East-European collection (undertaken by Witold Sworakowski in 1954), it has grown more than fivefold.⁴ It is therefore now one of the world's greatest academic resources for the study of the twentieth-century history of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

In round figures, the sizes of the various national collections in the Eastern-European and Soviet area are as follows:

⁴ Ibid., p. 3.

Journal

COUNTRY	MONOGRAPHS (Volumes)	PERIODICALS (Titles)	NEWSPAPERS (Titles)
Albania	1,200	21	14
Baltic States	5,000	500	100
Bulgaria	9,000	100	41
Czechoslovakia	24,000	300	150
Greece	3,000	115	45
Hungary	13,000	200	42
Poland	35,000	1,500	270
Romania	12,000	60	50
Russia	263,000	3,500	650
UKRAINE	6,000	230	80
Yugoslavia	18,000	350	180
TOTAL	389,200	6,876	1,622

Thus Ukrainian materials at the Hoover Institution represent about 1.5 per cent of the monographs, 3.4 per cent of the periodicals, and 4.9 per cent of the newspapers.⁵

One of the outstanding features of the Hoover Institution is its 263,000-volume Russian/Soviet collection and the 11,000 monographs found in the Baltic States and Ukrainian collections. Few libraries can match this in quantity or quality. While prerevolutionary Russia is particularly well covered, the largest section of this collection deals with the Soviet period. Topics such as the Comintern, War Communism, the Terror and forced labour, separatist movements, and the nationalities question are represented. As well, a substantial number of émigré and dissident (*samizdat*) pamphlets and publications are held in the library.

Finding Aids

The Institution has published both general and specialized bibliographies and guides as aids to those using this collection (and others). Two general surveys are Joseph D. Dwyer, ed., *Russia, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe: A Survey of Holdings at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace* (1980); and Charles G. Palm and Dale Reed, comps., *Guide to the Hoover Institution Archives* (1980).

Of the specialized surveys, one should mention Edward Ellis Smith, "The Okhrana," *the Russian Department of Police: A Bibliography* (1967); Helena Sworakowski, *List of Periodical Publications Published by Byelorussian, Russian, and Ukrainian DP's, 1945-1951* (1951); and Witold S. Sworakowski, *List of Polish Underground Collection* (1939).

⁵ Ibid., p. 4.

1945) in the Hoover Library (1948, revised by Helena Sworakowski, 1961).

Helena Sworakowski's survey is well supplemented by Roman Ilnytskyj's *The Free Press of the Suppressed Nations* (Augsburg, 1950), which can be found in the Hoover Institution's Library.

Using the Collections

The Russian/Soviet and East-European collections are housed in the Hoover Tower and the adjoining Archives. The main catalogue (Library-of-Congress system) is located on the ground floor of the Hoover Tower. There are also specialized catalogues for government and society publications, serials and newspapers, and separate drawers for émigré and refugee serials and publications.

The Library and Archives are open daily except Sundays and holidays. A competent and helpful reference staff makes document retrieval a simple matter. There is a wait of 20-30 minutes between the time material is requested and its delivery to the reference desk. The reading rooms are all spacious, comfortable and well appointed with numerous reference works.

No public photocopying facilities exist in the Library or Archives. However, limited amounts of material can be xeroxed by the staff. This requires making special arrangements during regular hours.

The Hoover Institution honors loan requests from outside researchers through other libraries, enabling those unable to travel to the Hoover Institution to get selected materials on interlibrary loan. Alternatively, modest travel grants are provided to visiting scholars who need to consult materials not available on interlibrary loan.

The special collections and manuscripts of an archival nature are held in the Hoover Institution's Archives, located at the courtyard level of the Herbert Hoover Memorial Building, just south of the Hoover Tower. Here the professional staff helps students and other researchers to use the Archives catalogue and various finding aids.

Ukrainian Materials at the Hoover Institution

Between July and September 1980, I was able to spend several weeks doing Ph.D-level research at the Hoover Institution. While my specific focus was on materials relating to the Ukrainian Displaced Persons, I tried to make at least a cursory examination of other records that might be of interest or of use in the future. As might be expected, given the statistical information provided above, an appreciable amount of material was located. No attempt will be made to describe it all here. However, the following remarks should provide at least some indication of the sort of materials one can expect to find.

a. The Okhrana Files

Between 1885 and 1917, the Imperial Russian Secret Police, known as the Okhrana, carried on resourceful and active counterintelligence and counterespionage against the revolutionaries of that epoch. Highly professional and even somewhat detached reports were forwarded daily to St. Petersburg. The Paris (European) headquarters of this organization, under the guidance of its chief, Rachkovsky, maintained a formidable network of agents and informers in France, Italy, Switzerland, England and even North America. By allowing its agents to operate at various levels of revolutionary activity, the Okhrana was able to compile a considerable amount of quite reliable information.

Upon the overthrow of the Tsarist government, the last Russian Imperial ambassador in Paris, Basil Maklakov, hid the Okhrana papers so that they would not be secreted away by the Soviets. In order to cover his actions, he publicly declared in 1926 that he had burned the contents of all the Okhrana files. In fact, in that same year, he had shipped them secretly to the Hoover Institution. His conditions had been straightforward: all sixteen wooden packing cases were to remain sealed until his death and the contents to be kept private for a further three months.

For years these crates remained in this condition. Finally, in July 1957, their existence was disclosed to a surprised world. Sorted and catalogued between 1962 and 1964, the Okhrana files became available to researchers. In all, there were 97,143 documents, 163,082 biographies and reference cards, 287 books, 16 boxes of photos, 465 newspapers and 7,550 receipts relating to the activities of various Okhrana agents.

In this important collection there are papers relating to a broad range of topics, from the political intervention of the Central Powers in the Russian revolutionary movement to German financial support of Trotsky. There are files relating also to the Ukrainian revolutionary movement of the time. Most of these items are stored in Box 210, section XXIII of the Okhrana materials. In it are archives relating to the Galician revolutionaries of 1914, to the Berlin-based and supposedly pro-German Ukrainian nationalists of the period, and a survey of the Ukrainian nationalist movement in 1916. These files not only reveal Russian appreciations of the strengths and weaknesses of the Ukrainian movement of this crucial period, but also that Okhrana agents were operating far afield in their attempts to penetrate and control the Ukrainian movement. For example, there exist Okhrana reports about "the Mazepa group" in Canada, data about M. Sichynsky, leader of a "Mazepa group" in the U.S.A., and reports on the "Ukrainian Congress in Canada, 1916-1917."⁶

⁶ These materials are currently being translated for the author by Dr. Richard Pierce, Department of History, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. Transcripts will eventually be made available.

b. The Ivan Petrushevich Collection

Possibly the largest collection of materials relating to Ukrainian affairs is that listed under the title “The Ivan Petrushevich [a.k.a. Evan Savidge] Collection.” These boxes contain a great amount of material on the Western Ukrainian National Republic, as well as data on the experiences of Ukrainian and Ruthenian immigrants in Canada before and during World War I. Materials relating to the Polish-Ukrainian war are particularly striking. For example, in Box 1 there is a translation of a letter from a Polish soldier, Bronisław Zajączkowski, written to Gregory Szost of Chicago. The letter was posted from Lemberg (Lviv) on 20 January 1920. In part, it reads:

... we are living in the villages and whatever we see belongs to us at the expense of the Haydamaks (Ukrainian peasants) We do whatever we like. I tell you, dear fellow, come here, you don't need of any America. The war is not over yet. You are young, join the army and you will make golden business. You will have as much money as you like.... We don't touch anything belonging to Poles, unless they are fools, as there are some Poles who take the part of the Haydamaks, but we don't give them any chance of reigning. Here was Poland and will be Poland. Who has seen Ukraine or ever heard of it, and the haydamaks shall have hope.

In Box 2 of this same collection there is a letter entitled “The Lemberg Palatinate, Presidential Department, Lemberg, 1, III, 1922. Strictly Private. To Be Memorized and Promptly Destroyed.” This letter, addressed to all country heads, tells them “1. to compile... an exhaustive list of all the Ukrainian intellectuals within your county.” In the event that there was to be any partition of “Little Poland” (Eastern Galicia) from the Polish state, these same men were further instructed to:

2. (take) ... every possible means (to prevent) this decision from being made known by any channel whatsoever to Ukrainian peasants or intellectuals, and attempts to spread such rumours by unauthorized persons shall be dealt with summarily with every conceivable vigour.

3. Should, however, the news transpire into towns and villages... Polish Indignation Meetings... will be organized... (and they) shall receive protection, while adequate measures for *immobilization* of all the Ukrainian malcontents shall be taken by the gendarmerie and eventually military Detachments. No attempt shall be made either at the interference with the natural and perfectly legitimate patriotic outbursts of the local Polish Defence Committees, or any undue assistance given to Jews or Ukrainians who may provoke by their behaviour the Polish patriotic feelings.

Journal

4. As the proclamation of Martial Law by the Central Authorities is very likely to follow, all the necessary steps shall be devised at an early stage for such summary dealings with probable Ukrainian risings and demonstrations as will ensure the least possible bloodshed on the part of Polish military and civilians, while making sure at the same time that Ukrainian rebels shall be put out of action once and for all. *Verbal* orders in these matters shall be given to subordinates.

c. The Parabel Project

Possibly the most intriguing discovery made in the archives of the Hoover Institution was the unearthing of the Parabel Project. Undertaken by the Hoover Institution in cooperation with the Operations Research Office of Johns Hopkins University (operating under contract with the U.S. Department of the Army, in 1949 or 1950), this project consisted of a comparative study of underground movements during and following World War II. The Parabel Project is now accessioned in three manuscript boxes (accession number 49007-13.09). Box 1 contains material on China under both Nationalist Republic and Red China labels; it also holds archival materials on the Kurdish Republic and Italy. Box 2 is dedicated wholly to France. It is in Box 3 that materials relating to Ukrainian affairs were located and then, in a sense, lost.

Box 3 contains material on Poland's Home Army (AK, or Armija Krajowa) as well as a (b) section, described as holding miscellaneous materials relating to various phases of the project. In this section, the following index references were located:

<i>Area</i>	<i>Groups</i>	<i>Code</i>
U.S.S.R.	Soviet partisans	SOV
	Ukrainians	UKR
	(UPA)	

Was there, in fact, ever an American study of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, the UPA? Or does this reference indicate only that such a probe was considered but never actually undertaken? Correspondence with Dr. Adorjan I. de Galffy, assistant archivist at the Hoover Institution, has not yet clarified this matter. His response to my enquiry was: "The register to this collection does not record materials relating to the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) or other materials under codes quoted in your letter such as SOV and UKR."⁷

⁷ Dr. Adorjan I. de Galffy to the author, 8 October 1980.

This question has to be resolved, if only to come to a fuller appreciation of American opinion regarding the Ukrainian liberation movement in this crucial period of its struggle. The files relating to the AK reveal attitudes far from supportive of Ukrainian nationalist aspirations. For example, in a manuscript by A. Kawczynski (AK 27/3) there is recorded the following passage:

Ukrainians (district Lvow) saw in the war an opportunity to pursue their own political aims, and acquired an attitude definitely hostile toward the Polish population and the Home Army. Their attitude was encouraged by Soviet partisans operating in these areas as well as by the Germans, and led, particularly in the south-eastern part of the Lvow district to a wholesale slaughter of the Polish population which was only checked by the appearance of Home Army partisan groups in the region.

The same manuscript goes on to record the objectives of a general uprising in Poland (AK 47/24, issued by the commander-in-chief of the Polish Home Army):

The objectives of the Uprising:

1. To destroy the German occupant.
2. To capture arms and military equipment.
3. To call a stop of Ukrainian aspirations.
4. To begin the reconstruction of the regular Armed Forces.
5. To cooperate in the reconstruction of the civil administration, communications system and armament industry.
6. To maintain order and peace throughout the country quenching all attempts at overthrowing the government or other subversive activities.
7. To expand the movement into such parts of Poland which would still not be liberated as well as such regions whose possession would be necessary for a future strong Poland.

The import of these statements will not be missed by students of modern Ukrainian-Polish relations.

In the meantime the search for the Parabel Project's files on the UPA—if such files ever existed—continues.

Conclusions

A great many other manuscripts, documents, photographs and publications could be cited to prove that the Hoover Institution is a resource centre of singular importance for students of Ukrainian affairs. It is hoped

Journal

that future works on Ukrainian themes will begin referring to materials in the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace.⁸

Lubomyr Y. Luciuk
University of Alberta

⁸ The thoughtfulness and support of the following people made both my stay in California and my research there a pleasant experience: Dr. Rekha Agarwala, Dr. Rene Barendregt, Dr. Adorjan I. de Galfy, Dr. Henry M. Madden, Ms. Ann O'Brien and the staff of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace. Travel support was provided by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Doctoral Fellowship.

REVIEWS

WŁADYSŁAW A. SERCZYK, *HISTORIA UKRAINY*. Wrocław, Warsaw, Cracow, and Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1979. 500 pp. Zł. 110.

Władysław A. Serczyk is a well-known Polish specialist in Ukrainian history. His book on the Koliivshchyna, *Kolischyna* (1968), was highly praised by serious scholars.¹ Serczyk has written several other books dealing with Ukraine and is the author of a chapter on Ukrainian history from 1569 to 1795 in a collective work published in Cracow in 1970, *Ukraina: Teraźniejszość i przeszłość*, ed. Mieczysław Karaś and Antoni Podraza. Finally, he is a contributor to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* and has recently become a member of its editorial board. His survey of Ukrainian history has been eagerly awaited. It came out late in 1979, even though the author's preface is dated July 1975: obviously there were people who tried to delay, if not prevent, its appearance. Be as it may, the distinguished Polish series of national histories, published by an even more distinguished Polish institution, the Ossolineum, now includes a history of Ukraine along with those published earlier (Canada, Czechoslovakia, England, Sweden, Lithuania, Armenia, Russia and, most recently, Belorussia). A printing of 10,000 is respectable and means that the volume will reach the general reader and not only the specialist.

It is impossible to do justice to this work in a brief review. As was to be expected, the most recent history is presented in the least satisfactory manner. Serczyk's story breaks off in 1945 (but there are two or three pages on the Ukrainian underground in Poland in 1945-7), even though the author says in the introduction that it is taken to the present. The chronology of events from 1945 to 1967 (why only to 1967?) that closes the book is very selective and rather idiosyncratic, but it is good to know that in 1958 the Ukrainian SSR ratified an international convention abolishing slavery. The Soviet period is covered in two chapters: Soviet Ukraine from 1921 to 1939, which, despite its title, also deals with the western-Ukrainian lands under Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia between the wars, and Ukraine during the Soviet-German war, 1941-5. The author toes the current Soviet line quite closely, but the careful reader will notice here and there some departures from it: coercion was

¹ See Zenon E. Kohut's review article "Myths Old and New: The Haidamak Movement and the Koliivshchyna (1768) in Recent Historiography," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1, no. 3 (September 1977): 371-4.

applied during the collectivization; the party and military cadres were killed in 1937-8; the Soviet administration in western Ukraine rather mechanically introduced models and institutions for which the local people had not been ready, and so on. There are also factual errors: it is not true that under German occupation an Ukrainian university "dominated by nationalists" was opened at Rivne. The Nazis did not allow a Ukrainian university to exist in Lviv or Kiev, let alone in Rivne, the "capital" of the Reichskommissar, Koch.

Two chapters are also devoted to the history of the revolution and "counterrevolution," roughly from 1917 to 1921. Again, the Soviet line is followed, but there are important differences as well. The author does not follow the Soviet practice of using the invective against those who opposed Bolshevism or Russia, so we do not read about Hrushevsky or Vynnychenko or Petliura (who gets a picture, which is unheard of in a Soviet book) being "the most evil enemies of the Ukrainian people," "agents of imperialism," and so on. The reader of Soviet literature is so used to such language that he is surprised to see that a Marxist, indeed even a Communist, can write differently.

But this is the point. Whatever Serczyk's ideological or political orientation may be, his Soviet colleagues who write on Ukraine are certainly not writing as Marxists. The current Soviet interpretation of Ukrainian history is based on the proposition that the Ukrainian nation has craved, ever since the fall of Kievan Rus, to be "reunified" with *Russia*. Secondly, the Soviet line treats the Russian state in a non-class manner: the Russian state, whether in the times of the Muscovite tsars or of the St. Petersburg emperors, somehow always followed foreign policies that were good for the Russian people and also the Ukrainian people. Indeed, tsarist rule in Ukraine, in the current Soviet interpretation, did not signify a *national* oppression for Ukraine: "reunification" with Russia freed the Ukrainians from national oppression. The student of historiography will easily see that the Soviet position has more in common with that of the "statist school" in prerevolutionary Russia than with Marxism or Leninism. (Indeed, in some respects it is further to the right of it and resembles the Black-Hundred view of Ukrainian nationalism as a product of foreign intrigues.)

For Serczyk (and other Polish historians), Ukraine is a normal nation, and just as the Slovaks, for example, are not said to have always wanted to be "reunified" with the Czechs, or the Dutch with the Germans, so the Ukrainians are allowed to have interests and aspirations of their own. This applies to Ukraine's relations with Poland, too. While Ukrainian-Polish relations receive full attention—the author opens his book with the comment that the history of Ukraine, like that of no other nation, is closely tied with Poland's history—there is no assumption that what was good for Poland was good for Ukraine or vice versa.

Perhaps the most interesting and valuable part of the book is that dealing with Ukraine in the seventeenth century. Serczyk shows the complexity of the social, economic, political and religious problems that separated the Ukrainians from Poland and points out that the road to Pereiaslav was by no means as straight as the Soviet propagandists assure us it was. The Ukrainians, says Serczyk, thought that they would deal with the tsar similarly to how the Polish *szlachta* dealt with the Polish king, but instead they were faced with an absolutist ruler who recognized no reciprocal accords between the sovereign and his subjects. Even the peasantry of Russia suffered greater oppression than that of Poland.

While these things may sound subversive in Kiev, they are, of course, commonplace elsewhere. Where Serczyk seems really at his best and most lucid is in his presentation of Ukrainian society and politics in the second half of the seventeenth century, when the nation was in the throes of civil strife while being an object of military and diplomatic manipulations by Poland, Muscovy and Turkey. This very messy story is usually presented in terms of all those hetmans and anti-hetmans whose names Ukrainian children are required to memorize. Here we have the facts and an analysis. It is a thought-provoking but also very depressing account.

These comments should suffice to show that Serczyk's book deserves attention. Let us express regret, however, that it lacks a proper bibliography, even though the author, we must admit, manages to list in his one-page note the famous multivolume history of Ukraine by Mykhailo Hrushevsky, for which there is no place in the bibliographies accompanying the eight-volume history of Ukraine recently published in Kiev. (There they list Kliuchevsky, Soloviov, even Tatishchev, but not Hrushevsky.) This is a pity, because this book will reach the reader who does not know that Poland is now a country where Ukrainian history is studied more seriously than in Ukraine itself and where a number of important books and monographs have been published. (Besides Serczyk himself, let us mention, by way of example, Zbigniew Wójcik, Jan Perdenia, Leszek Podhorodecki, Stefan Kozak, Jan Kozik, Miroslawa Papierzyńska-Turek, Zofia Zaks, Krzysztof Lewandowski, Ryszard Torzecki and Andrzej Chojnowski.) This is also a practice not followed in the other Ossolineum volumes: Marceli Kosman's history of Belorussia has a four-page bibliography, and Ludwik Bazylow's history of Russia manages to list even the English-language books by Florinsky, Paszkiewicz, Vernadsky, Seton-Watson and Riasanovsky.²

Roman Szporluk
University of Michigan

² Serczyk does manage, however, to acknowledge, in the list of illustrations, that Petliura's photograph comes from *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*, and that Skrypnyk's comes from Ivan Koszeliwec's *Mykola Skrypnyk* (Munich, 1972).

Journal

PAMPHIL D. IURKEVYCH, *TVORY*. Edited with an introduction by Stephan Jarmus. Winnipeg: St. Andrew's College, 1979. 141, 785 pp. \$45.00.

This volume is the first collection of Iurkevych's philosophical legacy. It consists of ten articles that are reproduced photographically from the various Russian journals in which they originally appeared between 1859 and 1870 and a lengthy introduction by Rev. S. Jarmus in Ukrainian and English. All but one of the articles are, by present standards, of book length—60 to 140 pages. Most of them deal with one of three broad philosophical questions: the place of reason and experience in knowledge (two articles), materialism (four articles) and the proof of God's existence (two articles). Of the remaining two articles, one is on the theory of man, the other on ethics. Iurkevych's other publications—two books and five long articles on pedagogy, brief articles on academic and political affairs, and book reviews—are not included in this collection.

Iurkevych (1826-74) was a priest's son and came from the Poltava region. After graduating from the Kiev Theological Seminary in 1851, he decided to devote himself to philosophy instead of embracing his father's vocation. His work received recognition, and in 1861 he was offered the chair of philosophy at Moscow University. Most of his philosophical writings were published at this time, in 1860-1. His masterly critique of N. Chernyshevsky's *Anthropological Principle in Philosophy* appeared in 1860 under the title "From the Science of the Human Spirit" and brought him an undeserved notoriety among the Russian intelligentsia. Iurkevych's other works received a fair amount of public attention at the time of their publication (see Ia. Kolubovsky, "Materiialy dlia istorii filosofii v Rossii 1855-1888," supplement I to *Voprosy filosofii i psichologii*, no. 5 (1890), pp. 33-44.) Since his death, however, Iurkevych's work has been largely neglected and forgotten. It is mentioned briefly in several encyclopedias and in N. Lossky's and V. Zenkovsky's histories of Russian philosophy, and is given a fuller critical account by D. Chyzhevsky in his *Narysy z istorii filosofii na Ukraini*. V. Soloviov's two articles on Iurkevych are more valuable for their biographical details than for philosophical commentary. The best philosophical exposition and evaluation of Iurkevych's work is G. Shpet's seventy-page article in *Voprosy filosofii i psichologii*, no. 125 (1914). Furthermore, no anthologies of Russian philosophy, whether in Russian or in translation, contain selections from Iurkevych's works. Why did his work receive so little attention?

Jarmus suggests that Iurkevych was neglected because his articles were unavailable (pp. 11, 81). I do not think that this is a significant reason. Iurkevych's articles were published in reputable scholarly journals that were easily accessible in pre-Soviet Russia and even at major libraries

in the West. Nor was it because his ideas were without influence on the development of Russian philosophy. As the teacher of Soloviov, Iurkevych had an important influence on Soloviov's general outlook, as well as particular doctrines. Through Soloviov his ideas probably influenced the next generation of Russian Christian thinkers. Jarmus, I think, exaggerates the influence of Iurkevych's doctrine of the heart and its similarity to such recent philosophical trends as personalism and existentialism. A detailed study of Iurkevych's influence can be written only after a thorough analysis of his ideas. One important reason why Iurkevych's writings have been neglected was, as Zenkovsky and Jarmus (pp. 48, 113) point out, Chernyshevsky's image of him as an obscure seminarian writer. Another reason is that Iurkevych's articles were highly sophisticated and academic. Unlike his opponents, he did not confuse issues that belonged to entirely different spheres, theoretical problems with socio-political ones. His writings must have struck the practically minded reading public as irrelevant and scholastic. Furthermore, in spite of his lucid style and simple language, Iurkevych is a philosophically sophisticated writer. His position is never simple: he tries to do justice to all points of view, to synthesize what is valid in them and to reject what is one-sided and false. Thus, he rejects certain aspects of idealism and accepts some features of materialism. He does not follow a school of thought, but arrives at his own position by evaluating critically the main philosophical schools. His criticisms are always illuminating, but not everyone can appreciate them. He is clear on what elements of various doctrines are worth preserving, but not how these elements are to be fitted together into a more comprehensive and truer doctrine. Perhaps this is the reason why he never worked out a philosophic system.

Jarmus's lengthy introduction is valuable for its biographical and historical information. However, his discussion of Iurkevych's ideas is not sufficiently analytical nor critical. It concentrates too much on Iurkevych's article on the heart, defining his philosophical outlook and influence almost exclusively on the basis of this article. Jarmus's claims about Iurkevych's place in the history of philosophy (pp. 24, 26, 72 in the Ukrainian introduction; pp. 91, 92, 138 in the English) are extravagant, and his assertions about the Ukrainian nature of Iurkevych's thought (pp. 18, 28; 86, 94) strike me as rather unsubstantiated. Besides these flaws, the introduction is sprinkled with many shortcomings that a good editor would have caught: important materials mentioned in the text do not appear in the bibliography (Aksakov's article and Kliuchevsky's correspondence with Gvozdev), page references are omitted in the bibliography, transliteration from the Russian is non-standard, translations of philosophical passages are sometimes inaccurate (p. 97). Yet, those who read the introduction and some of the succeeding articles will be grateful to Rev. Jarmus, as I am, for introducing them to a fine philo-

sophical mind and will wish Rev. Jarmus every success in making Iurkevych accessible to Ukrainian and English readers.

Taras D. Zakydalsky

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies

MAHDALYNA LASLO-KUTSIUK, *VELYKA TRADYTSIIA: UKRAINSKA KLASYCHNA LITERATURA V PORIVNIALNOMU VYSVITLENNI*. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979. 287 pp.

From the initial acquaintance with this work, one is impressed by the effective and competent approach to the subject, its scope and the polished scholarly eloquence of the author. Magdalena Laszlo-Kutiuk is a Ukrainian-Romanian scholar with publications, at least since 1970, dealing with comparative Slavic and other literatures, Ukrainian literature, and the early-modern Ukrainian writers especially. Her interest is reflected in *The Great Tradition*—a collection of eleven comparative studies of several Ukrainian writers and their Western-European counterparts. The author is not satisfied with the isolated approach to literary study that is often practiced, and sees the need to analyze the mutual stimulation of works and themes, specifically in relation to Ukrainian literature.

Laszlo-Kutiuk proposes to deal with particular themes and writers in order “to show how the tie between Ukrainian and world literature has its own coordinates not only for each new generation, but also for each outstanding writer.” By comparing Ukrainian writers with those in other literatures, she believes that the great national tradition itself may be exposed. It is a grand project that she undertakes, analyzing the integration of common themes in various literatures, their dependence on individual traditions, the contacts between specific literatures, and the correlation between the style, form and content of specific writers.

Laszlo-Kutiuk classifies her short (14-to-25 page) analyses under two headings—“Old Themes” and “Correlations” (more meaningful in Ukrainian as *spivzvuchnosti*). In the first series she compares Skovoroda’s philosophy (which she calls idealistic-Platonic with dialectical reasoning) that is often reflected in his fables with the single-plane Aesopian fables. She considers Skovoroda’s approach as two-leveled: one—direct, and the other, Biblical with anagogic mystical interpretation, which she skillfully deciphers. She sees these fables as “open works” (using Umberto Eco’s terminology), thus leaving opportunity for the readers’ input and interpretations. In another study she analyzes Horace’s treatment of the inevitability of death and of individual ethics in Ode X, and compares it with its adaptations by Skovoroda, Kotliarevsky and Shevchenko in terms of the semantic, thematic, dramatic and formal features. She concludes that

Shevchenko is closer to Horace in imagery, structure and the dramatic aspects, while Skovoroda and Kotliarevsky resemble Horace more in architectonics and the didactic approach.

In another essay, Shevchenko's, Pantaleimon Kulish's, Ivan Franko's and Lesia Ukrainska's adaptations of the Biblical psalms are analyzed with great expertise in terms of semantic parallelisms, uses of repetition, choice of adjectives, prosody and symbolic code. The author points out the added motivation of the writers to utilize the Biblical cloak especially after the Ems ukase. Next, Ivan Franko's Biblical theme—his poem "Moses"—is also studied for correspondences with other works; she finds that a poem by the Hungarian writer Imre Madách is the closest to it. Here a rather condensed analogy is made, dealing with stylistic coloration and the relationship between the protagonists and their environments. Then she discusses some similar factors in Lesia Ukrainska's *Cassandra* and Sophocles's *Oedipus the King*, especially in terms of the protagonists' feelings of guilt and the relation between truth and fate. Laszlo-Kutiuk focusses on Ukrainska's *Cassandra*, in which the problem of whether words are dependent on events or vice versa is posed. This specific study is not so much a comparison as a discussion of the role, myth, truth and *soujet* in the above dramas. In order to find the homology between the two works, she further seeks a semantic isotopy between Ukrainska's dramatic *poema* and Schiller's ballad "Cassandra." The latter work is analyzed in Franko's translation only; thus one fails to see the full reliability of this aspect of comparison.

In the section entitled "Correlations" Shevchenko's "Kateryna" and Baratynsky's "Eda" are compared. These two works share a common basic plot—the unrequited love of a young girl who is taken advantage of by a foreigner; the girl, in turn, symbolizes the two backdrop countries (Ukraine and Finland) and their respective relationship with the Russian rulers. Despite this external similarity, Laszlo-Kutiuk finds the resulting two products not equally effective. Shevchenko had the greater advantage in his close acquaintance with the local ethnography and folklore (which he generously utilized as part of his Romantic style), while Baratynsky knew Finland only superficially and employed the traditional realistic approach.

In her comparative studies, the author is certainly not afraid to contradict existing claims by some critics about a particular influence of an author upon Ukrainian writers. Thus, in relation to Panas Myrny's prose she sees no proof for asserting that he followed Ivan Turgenev and argues further that both of them learned equally from Gogol. In comparing Myrny's story "Among the Steppes" (1885) and Chekhov's "Steppes" (1888), Myrny is shown as surpassing the Russian writer, especially in his mastery of the *paysage*. Laszlo-Kutiuk notes Myrny's highly developed stylistic approach, his use of parallelisms, his rhythmic prose in particular,

and comments that regrettably he has but few followers in Ukrainian literature. Another disclaimer is directed at those who write that Kotsiubynsky also learned from Chekhov. She denies this and, on the contrary, stresses that the source of influence on Kotsiubynsky was Western Europe, and particularly Arthur Schnitzler. She believes that Kotsiubynsky's post-1901 prose should be assigned to the tradition of world literature, since he obviously had demonstrated the need for synchronization with it and was quite immersed in experimentation (e.g., his specific use of the stream-of-consciousness technique). In her discussion of the existing contradictory studies, especially that of the novella "The Apple Blossoms," attention is directed to an analogous theme treatment in Schnitzler's "Live Hours" and "Flowers."

In her comparison of Ukrainka and Gerhart Hauptmann, Laszlo-Kutiuk relies partly on Ukrainka's 1901 article (discovered only in 1976) on Hauptmann's *Michael Kramer*. Based on this study, as well as on Ukrainka's own translation of Hauptmann's *Weavers* (into Ukrainian and Russian), it is shown how well the poetess understood Hauptmann's key issues—situations of isolation and hopelessness. While Ukrainka also utilized this common point of departure, she interpreted the conflicts (e.g., societal or family obligations versus art) quite differently. Laszlo-Kutiuk suggests that the archetypal analysis be employed to compare the two writers; this may disclose the use of two dissimilar local folklores and their significance.

Falling also within the same chronological period of Laszlo-Kutiuk's interest are Franko and Zola, and Izidor Vorobkevych. Vasile Alecsandri, a Romanian poet, is described as having influenced Vorobkevych, who in turn served as a source of inspiration to Oton Zupančič, a Slovenian poet who translated Vorobkevych's works.

This collection of essays does not exhaust the suggested period for the purpose of comparative studies. While some discussions are quite thorough (especially in the first part, "Old Themes"), the others may serve as suggestions to be followed through and developed further. But the groundwork has been laid, and one may only wish to see more studies on Ukrainian writers approached from the comparative point of view.

Laszlo-Kutiuk's intellectual pursuance of ideas and arguments is not limited in most cases by non-scholarly regulations. The author has access to works written also by Western scholars (Wellek, Warren, Picchio), to literary studies by Soviet Ukrainian critics, and to works written by Ukrainian scholars in the West (Chyzhevsky, Ilarion and Shevelov). Potentially, therefore, this work could serve well as a bridge and a vehicle of making some of her ideas known also in Ukraine today. One look at the printing (of 545!), however, portends little hope for such a possibility. Nevertheless, at least the very existence of this excellent work (with a

respectable author index) is a great event in itself, a tradition to be recovered and continued.

Larissa M. L. Zaleska Onyshkevych
G. W. Ball Institute, Princeton

BOHDAN WYTWYCKY, *THE OTHER HOLOCAUST—MANY CIRCLES OF HELL*. Washington: a research project of *The Novak Report*, 1980. 96 pp.

Dante could not have imagined it. Such is the judgment of many a survivor of Auschwitz or of any one of a myriad of concentration camps or prisoner-of-war camps in which members of more than a dozen nationalities perished in anonymity four decades ago. For the Jews of Europe, the Nazi "solution" was "final"; for the much larger numbers of Poles, Russians or Ukrainians, it was an outline of obliteration that even in its incompleteness claimed the lives of millions. A great deal of information has been assembled about the destruction of Jewry; from the end of the war, in Europe, America and Israel, research has been conducted to uncover the details of this catastrophe, but not nearly as much is known about the fate of other peoples under Nazi rule. Bohdan Wytycky's *Other Holocaust* is a small, carefully written account that is virtually unique in calling attention to that omission.

Wytycky's effort was sponsored by Michael Novak as a "beginning" towards much larger investigations that are yet to be attempted. At the very least, however, Wytycky has already drawn up the agenda, he has written a table of contents and given some examples, from monographs and memoirs, of German policies and actions. One of these illustrations speaks volumes. It is the story of a series of soccer games between German and Ukrainian teams in Kiev. The Ukrainians always won, and finally the Germans verbalized a desire for a victory. When the Ukrainians did not give in, they were dispatched to Babyn Iar to be shot.

In statistical recapitulations, Wytycky has tried to provide figures of total human losses attributable to German occupation policies. These data should be treated with some caution. It is extraordinarily difficult to make estimates of Eastern-European dead (and that is equally true of calculations in the case of Dutch, Yugoslav or Greek victims), simply because a large percentage of the fatalities were caused by starvation, disease or maltreatment in relatively open environments, such as cities and the countryside, as opposed to the closed ghettos and camps in which counting was more frequent and detailed. Moreover, it may not be easy to distinguish between Poles and Ukrainians, or Russians and Ukrainians, in areas where they lived together. One figure, however, is firm: it is the compilation of dead Soviet prisoners of war (Russians, Ukrainians

Journal

and Belorussians in that order) that the Germans themselves prepared in 1944, and which was then two million.

For readers particularly interested in Ukrainian suffering, the mere fact that the Ukrainian territory in its entirety was occupied by German invaders is an indication of the magnitude of the Ukrainian disaster. Whatever may have been the total number of civilian dead behind German lines within the boundaries of the USSR, the heaviest losses of any non-Jewish nationality may have been—as Wytywycky believes—the Ukrainian. Wytywycky does not overlook the incidents of Ukrainian collaboration, but no reader of this pamphlet should remain in any doubt that in German eyes the Ukrainian nation as a whole was a part of a vast sea of “sub-humanity” that inhabited the eastern portions of the European continent.

Raul Hilberg
University of Vermont

ULAS SAMCHUK, *SLIDAMY PIONERIV: EPOS UKRAINSKOI AMERYKY*. Jersey City., N.J.: Svoboda Press, n. d. 268 pp.

The dean of contemporary émigré Ukrainian novelists presents us this time with a loose collection of chapters that is best described as a mixture of genres. The unifying theme is the continuity of the evolution of Ukrainian consciousness in America and of the organized forms it assumed, from difficult beginnings in Pennsylvania's Anthracite Valley to the present day. The subtitle is somewhat misleading, since the material is not presented as running narrative but as a congeries of historical flashbacks, travel-diary fragments, personal reflections, directories of Ukrainian communities in several American cities, and even excursions into U.S. history and geography. This makes for some lively reading, but at the same time the burden of putting the pieces together falls squarely upon the reader.

The book is dedicated to the Ukrainian National Association and at times reads almost like an institutional promotion brochure. This is a pity, inasmuch as the emphasis on one organization tends to result in glossing over the developments and contributions of other such entities. Also, for all the praise directed at the UNA, one is left with little real understanding of the specific ways in which it and parallel organizations helped or affected the individual immigrant; the focus is mostly on the organizational network itself. Apart from this slight imbalance, the author tries to give “equal time” to the different religious and social divisions within the Ukrainian community and maintains a scrupulous (didactic?) neutrality toward its several political factions. Samchuk's own political creed, mentioned here because it colors his perceptions throughout, is forcefully impressed on the reader through his unequivocal endorsement

of the independent-nationalist position and his pleas for Ukrainian unity, which are coupled with expressions of enthusiasm about those manifestations of solidarity that he witnessed in his travels.

A brief introductory sketch of the American setting is followed by three chapters that detail the origins of the UNA and of its press organ, *Svoboda*, but actually tell a much larger story. This is in many ways the strongest part of the book. Samchuk succeeds brilliantly in evoking the atmosphere of the immigrants' early struggle for self-definition and respect. The events and issues of the 1890s come alive in his deceptively casual vignettes, and the heroic figures of the pioneer-founders are presented almost as personal acquaintances. The author never tires of stressing the decisive role of the intellect, and therefore of the clergy and the educated few, but he also shatters the myth of the intelligentsia's monopoly on leadership by introducing case after case of outstanding initiative and accomplishment by individuals of peasant backgrounds.

What follows is a travelogue of the author's progress across "Ukrainian America," from the East to the Midwest to California. From the avalanche of names, facts, impressions and recollections that largely make up this part of the book, one gets a fairly well-articulated image of the Ukrainian-American community. There are few outright generalizations—the anecdotal format does not inspire them—but there are some, and others may be gleaned from the author's comments on particular situations. Repeated emphasis is placed on the differences in social composition, education, taste, intellectual level and national consciousness between the early immigrants and the people who make the community what it is today. At the same time, Samchuk underlines the spiritual and cultural continuity between the pioneers and contemporary Ukrainian-Americans, as well as the overarching *sobornist* seen in the participation of people of all regions, religions and ideological persuasions in common undertakings. He notes the propensity to form, and be actively involved in, voluntary associations (but tends to see it as a characteristic of Ukrainians rather than as evidence of their Americanization). One is struck by the amount of overlap in personnel among the associations, suggesting that the seeming "over-organization" may actually mean that the same people are the active core of several groups, while others (an unknown quantity) remain uninvolved.

Samchuk focusses on the political awareness and functions of the UNA, UCCA and other organizations, but has disappointed this reviewer by failing to comment on the more colorful, if often less happy, aspects of factional politics. His only statement on the busy realm of party and ideology is that like everything else, it is much-organized but remains the one area where things are still not the way they should be.

There is little mention of the Ukrainians' relation to, and participation in, the larger society. The impression one gets is almost that of a col-

lectivity suspended in *vacuo*, with few links to tie them to other Americans. Samchuk has good reasons for this. First, Ukrainians in the United States, though numerically a sizable group, still remain "invisible," because of both misidentification and Anglo conservatism, which clings to obsolete conceptions, particularly where Eastern Europe is concerned. Second, the early immigrants were held back by all the usual social barriers that await speech-less rural newcomers in an urban setting. Third, even now Ukrainians remain rather effectively isolated: "what [goes on] out there in the street does not concern us" (p. 244). To be sure, this is a different kind of isolation, self-imposed by the feeling of distinctiveness, made possible by the institutional completeness of the ethnic community, perhaps reinforced by the fear of assimilation.

The book is replete with insights into the Ukrainian condition, its problems and its needs. Even though he can see beyond it to the universally human, Samchuk stresses the importance of nationalism as a vital need for Ukrainians in their present unique and anomalous situation. He points up some of the historical causes of that situation; beneath the flourishing network of organizations and the soundness of many individuals, his keen, compassionate eye reveals serious, lingering problems. Writing of the 1890s, he noted among the obstacles to Ukrainian unity "the old peasant sores—envy, morbid suspiciousness, ill will, and lack of [national] consciousness" (p. 97); and he views the 1967 World Congress of Free Ukrainians as an attempt to bring together "brothers [who suffer from] shattered character, fractured speech, injured pride, confused... principles" (p. 254). In the past, the chief villains were timidity and "the cancer of intellectual impotence" (p. 30), but the author warns that even now "it will not be easy to liberate ourselves from the burden of our inheritance—long centuries of coercion" (p. 253). Finally, he alludes to the increasing problem of indifference, reporting an old-timer's complaint about the young who are too busy with their own affairs to give time to the *Soiuz*.

Yet the book's dominant tone is optimistic. *Slidamy pioneriv* is a good book to read, a forward-looking book that derives hope for the future from the solid achievements of the past. It exudes a quiet confidence in the ultimate vitality of the Ukrainian cause, the basic strength of all those men and women who, while possessed by an all-pervasive dream, are at the same time going about their daily business, coping with the trauma of their transplantation, and adding the flavor of their culture and experience to the fluid, ever-growing mosaic of American pluralism. There is little evidence in the book of Ukrainians being drawn into any "melting pot," and even less of any worry on Samchuk's part about the amount of assimilation that has taken place. Unlike so many others, he does not despair at the fact that many young people no longer use the language: he accepts the process as natural, recognizing that

language is only one of several components of ethnic identity and by no means synonymous with nationalist loyalty. As elsewhere in his thinking, balance is the key here. The image of the "ideal" Ukrainian-American that emerges is that of a person who is contributing to American society while maintaining a link with ancestral tradition and an active concern for the interests of Ukrainians everywhere, guided by the desire for Ukraine's independence.

It seems that most of the people Samchuk encountered in his travels live up to this ideal, and that makes one pause and think. The author's many hosts and contacts were either old acquaintances or leaders and activists in their respective communities—certainly a very biased sample. What about those not encompassed by the overlapping network of associations? The non-churchgoers, the young who have lost not only the language but their sense of ethnicity, those disenchanted or alienated by factionalism in their localities, and, most important, the simply indifferent, to whom Samchuk refers, almost incidentally, as *khakhly*? There is danger in shrugging them off as marginal, exceptional, or even as negative cases. They are an integral part of the process of community building, transformation and attrition, a result of the interplay of co-operation and conflict within and between the various segments of the Ukrainian-American population: "old" vs. "new" arrivals, the "common people" and the intelligentsia, the successful and the failures. It is imperative for anyone seriously interested in the workings and fortunes of the Ukrainian community in diaspora to understand the causes and the implications of this phenomenon of non-involvement.

The book's narrative suffers from an overload of factual detail and statistical data. Some of these enhance its informative value, but others are hardly salient, e.g., U.S. industrial-production figures (p. 78) or the livestock inventory of one of California's old missions (p. 224). The same applies to the inclusion of hundreds of names of people whom the author met, however casually. In view of this, some of the omissions appear particularly striking. Among major cities, Detroit, with its rich cultural life, its unique museum-archive in Hamtramck and, most recently, the only secular Ukrainian high school in the country, is hardly mentioned. The lists of artists in Philadelphia and New York show glaring gaps (Mukhyn, Moroz, Chereshniovsky, Gerulak . . .). Little attention is given to the development of the business sector, and even less to the organization of sports activities, which are so important because of their appeal to the young.

There is a fair number of inaccuracies, individually trivial but cumulatively annoying. Add to this the lack of a publication date, no credit for the uncommonly attractive cover design, and the many typographical errors, and one must conclude that the editors were on vacation when the manuscript was being readied for the printer. Perhaps this also

accounts for the many atrocities against grammar and syntax, as well as the inadequate and inconsistent transliteration of foreign names and the spelling of Ukrainian ones. Such things detract from the readability and enjoyment of *Slidamy pioneriv*, even though the author's style, power of image-making, and eloquence still manage to shine through. The readers of Samchuk's work—and there should be many—deserve much better. Perhaps a revised and corrected second edition?

The appended biography of the author by Dr. Luka Luciw helps place many of Samchuk's ideas in personal and historical context. It is best read before starting on the book itself.

Ihor V. Zielyk

Seton Hall University and

Ukrainian Institute for Social Research

DAVID J. CARTER, *BEHIND CANADIAN BARBED WIRE: ALIEN, REFUGEE AND PRISONER OF WAR CAMPS IN CANADA 1914-1946*. Calgary: Tumbleweed Press, 1980. x, 334 pp. \$20.00.

At first reading, there seems little to recommend this book to students of Canadian history. Purportedly, it deals with the internment of aliens, refugees and prisoners of war in Canada from 1914 to 1946. This is a vast topic, and this book does not really accomplish its stated purpose. In fact, the concern is largely with the Second-World-War imprisonment of German prisoners of war in Canada. References to the interwar period's jailings and deportations are all but totally missing, and the work only briefly touches upon the internment operations of 1914 to 1920.¹ Unfortunately, even the account of the World-War-II POWs is marred by being grafted onto a description of the author's odyssey around Canada and Europe, apparently looking for prosaic and poetic inspiration (and bits of old barbed wire) at locations that once witnessed other men's sorrows. The resulting hodgepodge reduces the work's value as a history and leaves the reader sorting through the volume trying to divine the author's intentions. Further readings do little to help.

Avoiding substantial discussion of the controversial yet recurrently significant issue involved in these internments (e.g., the violation of civil liberties by xenophobia-fuelled governments), the author instead dwells on what were, after all, the judicial executions of convicted murderers (who just happened to be, simultaneously, POWs in Canada). While

¹ Although World War I ended in 1918, individuals remained interned until 1920. The reasons for this are variously interpreted; a thorough analysis is still required.

their fates (deserved or not is a moot point) are bemoaned, very little attention is paid to the injustices suffered by “enemy aliens” in Canada between 1914 and 1920. Over 8,000 men, women and children were placed in captivity in twenty-four camps across Canada during these years, *supposedly* because of their sympathy with the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Many of them were hunted down, imprisoned and even driven mad or killed. Yet search in vain for some record of these deceased prisoners’ names in this book, even though all of the German POWs who died in Canadian camps during World War II are listed in an appendix.² Does only Teutonic stock elicit the sympathies of the author? Should tears be shed for POWs who were enemies of “our side” in World War I? Can compassion extend even to those who retained Nazi ideas right up to their rendezvous with the hangman’s noose?³ Why is there no description of the experiences of the thousands of Ukrainians, Slovaks, Czechs, Jews, Bulgarians, Turks and even Russians and Frenchmen who were interned in Canada from 1914 to 1920? Surely it is by now realized that Canadian history does not originate solely in an island across the ocean nor derive exclusively from accounts of the exploits of Anglo-Celts or other “Northern Europeans.” In the author’s own Alberta, Canada’s substantial debt to Central- and Eastern-European immigrants is evident. Recalling this, revisiting the Lethbridge camp’s site, and checking local newspaper archives against records in Ottawa should all point the author to a more factual appreciation of who was locked up there from 1914 to 1916. Most of them were not Germans.

There are other numerous and serious flaws in this book. Internment operations lasted from 1914 to 1920, then again from 1939 to 1946. Equal periods of time, yet the former is accorded only some sixty pages as opposed to over 250 pages for the latter, despite the fact that the first internment operations probably had a more lasting impact on Canadian society than did the confinement of enemy sailors and soldiers during the Second World War.

No discussion of the jailing of members of the Canadian Communist Party during the interwar period is attempted, despite the fact that many were “aliens” of Jewish, Ukrainian and Finnish backgrounds. Little attention is paid to the plight of Jewish refugees from Europe, many of

² Incorrectly titled “Prisoners of War Who Died While under Canadian Control.” When? A reading of Major-General Sir William Otter’s report on the Internment Operations of 1914 to 1920 would have provided the author with the names of at least three Slavic internees “killed while attempting to escape.” They were John Băuzek, Iwan Gregoraszchuk, and Andrew Grapko.

³ The German prisoner, Sergeant Werner Schwalb, died on the gallows on 26 June 1946. His last words were: “My Führer, I follow thee!”

whom ended up in Canadian camps during World War II, identified as Germans. The bibliography includes works whose relevance is not readily apparent, while omitting studies that can be considered salient.⁴ While 151 photographs do add to the book's value, they are very poorly described and labelled. For example, photographs of the Fort Henry camp (at Kingston, Ontario) are credited to the St. Lawrence Parks Commission. Accurate in the mundane sense of identifying the current guardian of Fort Henry's artifacts, this accreditation is, nonetheless, ridiculous in the historical sense. It was actually Mr. Harry Spring, a local soldier, who took many of these pictures. Others originated with the young Captain Watson Kirkconnell, whose personal role in the internment operations and subsequent reputation as a student of Canada's ethnocultural communities requires closer examination.⁵

The author apparently used some primary-source materials in the preparation of this book. Yet, if he used the internment operations files stored in the Public Archives of Canada (Ottawa), he must have become painfully aware of the fact that many, possibly crucial files are missing. Where are they? And why did the author make no mention of these gaps in the documentary record?⁶

⁴ Books about the Afrika Korps and the Luftwaffe are included, yet J. A. Boudreau's Ph.D. thesis, "The Enemy Alien Problem in Canada, 1914-1921" (Department of History, University of California—Los Angeles, 1965) is not listed.

⁵ Kirkconnell described his experiences in two articles: "When We Locked Up Fritz: The First Authentic Story of Our Internment Camps," *Maclean's*, 1 September 1920, pp. 20-1, 58-63, and "Kapuskasing—A Historical Sketch," *Bulletin of the Departments of History and Economic Science*, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, no. 38, 1921.

⁶ The fate of the missing documents was discovered by Peter Melnycky and reported in his paper "The Internment of Ukrainians in Canada during the First World War," 1981. Melnycky found, in M. Swift's "Arrangement of Archival Units" (in *Papers Prepared for the 1974 Archives Course*, Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, Archives Section, 1974, pp. 10-14), the following quotation:

Some time ago the Archives received a series of files relating to internment operations during the Great War. There was an individual file for each internee and the files were arranged in a numerical series. Close examination revealed that the only document of any significance on each file was the certificate of release. These were detached and the rest of the file destroyed. The certificates were then organized in an alphabetical arrangement.

Apparently, other topical files are also missing. Whoever was responsible for their destruction is guilty of erasing pages from Canadian history.

The book leaves an overall impression of being hurried. Sometimes authors become so enraptured with the research experience that they fail to take the time necessary to reflect on what they are recounting. When this occurs, readers are frequently treated to an over-rich compost of details but little depth of thought. If this author had pondered the implications of the internment operations and delved into the impact that they had on many immigrants who came to Canada to escape just such persecution, everyone would have been better off. He may have ended up crafting a much-needed history, and his readers would have been invited to explore a little-known page in Canada's past. Instead he has left us with many details, some clues but few insights. For some of this we can thank him. But we are still left looking for a definitive account of internment operations in Canada.

Lubomyr Y. Luciuk
University of Alberta

ROMAN RAKHMANNY, *IN DEFENCE OF THE UKRAINIAN CAUSE*. Ed. Stephen D. Olynyk. North Quincy, Mass.: Christopher Publishing House, 1979. 297 pp.

Rakhmanny's book is not a good example of Epstein's Law, which posits that "Radical writing dependably rots after a decade." It is a collection of forty-four political commentaries about the Ukrainian liberation movement written between 1948 and 1976 that admirably have stood the test of time. His clear and crisp essays are directed mostly at Soviet cosmology and its persistent efforts to prove that the earth is flat.

Clearly, Rakhmanny is one of the most prescient and eminent Ukrainian voices of our time. Hardly out from under the rubble, as early as 1948 Rakhmanny wrote of the UPA's continued resistance to Soviet power in the vicinity of Kiev, west of Kharkiv, north of Odessa, and of what he then called the "unknown front" and the "forgotten barricade." On that forgotten barricade, also, the first "national communism" to resist Russian Soviet power was Ukrainian communism and not the later Titoism. Ukraine had its own Milovan Djilas in Mykola Khvylovych, who in the 1920s argued that the Party had developed into a "new class" of Russian empire builders.

In 1954, when the story was not seeing the light of day, Rakhmanny wrote of "dreadful scenes in Germany in which Ukrainian patriots—so called D.P.'s—were handed over at bayonet point to the Russians, immediately after the war in accordance with the Yalta Agreement." Nikolai Tolstoy's *Victims of Yalta* (1977), about the two million people handed over to Stalin in the years 1944-7 by the Western Allies and their terrible fate, today completely vindicates Rakhmanny and substantiates his charge.

Before Rakhmanny, only George Orwell lamented these victims and the “voluntary conspiracy” to suppress the whole cruel story, which Orwell blamed on the “poisonous effect of the Russian *mythos* on English intellectual life; that is, the prevalent view . . . that Stalin’s Russia was a truly free and just society.”

Not only on these issues is Rakhmanny in good company. Recently, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn argued in “Misconceptions about Russia Are a Threat to America” that the “incompetent use” of the Voice of America broadcasts was (and is) a “strategic error” and an “irreparable blunder.” In 1948, Rakhmanny also criticized the Voice of America by quoting Senator Benton of Connecticut, who charged that the Voice of America had “a frog in its throat.”

In 1956 Rakhmanny wrote about Ukrainians and others in the GULag and that Ukrainians “initiated the first prisoners’ strike in the Karaganda camp system in 1952 while Stalin was still alive.” Through these rebellions, Soviet citizens “received proof that the police forces of the totalitarian Russian system were not invincible.” And twenty years later, we have Solzhenitsyn in *The GULag Archipelago*: “I do not know about other places (they started killing in all the special camps, even the Spassk camp for the sick and disabled) but in our camp it began with the arrival of the Dubovka transport—mainly Western Ukrainians, O.U.N. members. The movement everywhere owed a lot to these people and indeed it was they who set the wheels in motion. The Dubovka transport brought us the bacillus of rebellion.”

Solzhenitsyn continues: “These sturdy young fellows, fresh from the guerrilla trials, looked around themselves in Dubovka, were horrified by the apathy and slavery they saw, and they reached for their knives . . . [they began] *making law* . . . murder became the rule . . . [and] the prisoners’ ear heard the subterranean gong of justice . . . [from] an invisible court . . . and the informers . . . stopped informing . . . The information machine on which alone the fame of the omnipotent and omniscient Organs had been based in decades past had broken down . . . I don’t think history records anything like it.”

In a number of articles between 1959 and 1968, before the first Nixon administration, Rakhmanny presaged the West’s “opening to China,” the “China card,” and perhaps even de-Maoization. During this period he described China as an “unwilling collaborator of Soviet Russia . . . who threatens as a dagger at the soft underbelly of the Soviet Union.” China “seems to enter cagily into the fray by consistently raising the Ukrainian problem against Peking’s enemies in the Kremlin . . . Ukrainians may yet find an unexpected ally in Communist China.”

The most interesting moments in this book are when Rakhmanny pronounces on the big historical questions. Although the book is organized

topically, attention to dates shows that in the 1960s, as a result of de-Stalinization, Rakhmanny began to reconsider the underpinnings of his own nationalism. In 1961 he wrote: "from 1958 till 1961, the Ukraine was evidently being allowed a limited opportunity to play the role of model Communist state, the perfect demonstration of the Communist solution to the national aspiration of the Afro-Asian peoples." Rakhmanny sensed a "thaw" under "the African sun of independence."

In 1961 he wrote "The Emergence of a Submerged Nation in the Soviet Union." Then came the interesting "Comrade Enko — The Warhorse of Russia" in 1964, where Rakhmanny spoke of "the lonely Russian people" with whom Ukrainians have "common interests." In his view, the role of Ukrainians in the Soviet Empire is akin to the "Scotsman who ran the British Empire." And Rakhmanny wondered "to what extent Ukrainian nationalism [was] being satisfied and integrated into empire building of the 'elder brother'?"

During this period, Rakhmanny argued (in 1959) that Russia needs "time and peace" and the "need to bypass the Commandments of ideology," because "necessity governs the country of socialism as much as it does the countries of capitalism." One hears echoes of James Burnham's *Managerial Revolution* and John Kenneth Galbraith's *New Industrial State*, and the "imperatives of technology."

In 1966 Rakhmanny wrote "Revolution has ceased to be the motivating force within the Party and in the Soviet Union." Again he presaged an eminent thinker, this time George Kennan. Not the George Kennan of "Mr. X" and the "containment theory," but the recent new George Kennan of "Mr. X Reconsiders," who believes the USSR has lost its revolutionary zeal and is a status-quo power.

Rakhmanny's "reconsideration" and his persistent effort to "talk to Ukraine" also led him to an interesting relationship to the "question of Lenin." In 1970 he wrote "The Great Witness," in which he described Lenin's "genuine greatness," Lenin's "forceful and dignified argument" and his efforts "to prevent the inevitable from happening right before his own eyes." Rakhmanny was, no doubt, referring to Lenin's essays on nationality policy, his displeasure with the "Georgian affair" and his increasing concern about the resurgence of "Great Russian chauvinism." He also must have been justifiably impressed with Ivan Dzyuba's *Internationalism or Russification?* (1968). As Rakhmanny argues, it is very possible that the publication of "Lenin's Testament" in 1956 caused "many a Russian and Ukrainian to start thinking on their own." But when he suggests Lenin can thereby be considered the father of the dissident movement, it is easy to see why Rakhmanny ran into difficulty with both his nationalist friends and his Soviet adversaries. This is not the Lenin of nationalist demonology nor the Lenin of Soviet hagiography. And it is not the *Lenin*... Solzhenitsyn introduces us to... *in Zurich*.

However, on the biggest question of all, the debate about Russification (or "continuity") and Sovietization (or "discontinuity"), Rakhmanny consistently comes down on the side of those who argue the Russification (and "continuity") thesis. In 1965 he wrote "The Ukrainians in Russia continue to suffocate under the traditional Czarist system of Russification." In 1969 he said "What is alive, however, is—according to Ivan Dzyuba—the spirit of Old Russia, with all national and international objectives." In 1971: "The traditional policy of Russification of the old and newly acquired non-Russian territories make Soviet reality today essentially the same as it was in prerevolutionary times. In this respect Russia has not changed." In 1972 he again spoke of the "unchanging human condition of the Soviet classocrats." And in 1973 he described the "harsh fact of hardly changing Soviet reality."

Marxists, of course, argue "discontinuity" and focus only on the process of Sovietization. Nationalists (like Rakhmanny) argue "continuity." The USSR is a continuation of tsarist, old Russian, imperialist Russification in Ukraine. Unfortunately, since the articles in this volume appeared before Solzhenitsyn's arrival in the West, we do not have the benefit of Rakhmanny's response to the "Solzhenitsyn thesis," which argues that Russia has always had two traditions: the indigenous eastern Slavophile tradition and the foreign Western tradition. Marxism is part of the foreign, Western one. Solzhenitsyn says the Bolshevik Revolution is a "discontinuity" of the Slavophile, tsarist, old Russian, spiritual, Orthodox tradition, but a "continuity" of its foreign one. The Bolshevik Revolution is Western Enlightenment, science, rationalism, secularism, democracy brought to their brutal logical conclusion. Given Rakhmanny's preoccupation with the problem of Ukrainian liberty and its indivisible relationship to the most central intellectual question of our time—the Bolshevik Revolution—we will no doubt continue hearing Rakhmanny torment his ideological adversaries. Like Camus, he will not soon stop his struggle with "modern mouthwashes." As his book shows, he has constantly struggled to see what is, as George Orwell said, "in front of your nose." That is why Rakhmanny can be found in the Soviets' pantheon of bêtes noires.

Yarema Gregory Kelebay
McGill University

STEPHAN M. HORAK, COMP. *RUSSIA, THE USSR, AND EASTERN EUROPE: A BIBLIOGRAPHIC GUIDE TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE PUBLICATIONS, 1964-1974*. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1978. 488 pp.

Every bibliography is a welcome addition for the researcher; this is no less the case with Mr. Horak's most recent contribution. Although original-

ly intended to be a revision of his *Junior Slavica* (1968), the present volume is much more comprehensive, for it includes titles on literature, linguistics and the fine arts.

The bibliography is divided into three parts: the first section deals with general works on the USSR, Eastern Europe and communism; the second, with specific studies on Russia (to 1917), the Soviet Union, the non-Russian Soviet republics, and Jews in the USSR; and the third, with works on Eastern Europe, which includes the Balkans, East Germany, Hungary, Rumania and Albania.

Every entry is annotated, primarily with excerpts from reviews in leading scholarly journals. Mr. Horak has included his own comments when such reviews have been lacking.

The usefulness of such annotations varies considerably, sometimes bordering on the tendentious, especially those cited from the *Ukrainian Quarterly*, and the somewhat didactic, for example, comments by Mr. Horak himself (nos. 146, 576). The fact that historical studies on Russia and the Soviet Union are grouped together makes the bibliography a somewhat clumsy reference tool. Finally, readers should be made aware that only published monographs, and neither articles nor dissertations, have been included.

Yury Boshyk
University of Toronto

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALLWORTH, Edward, ed. *Ethnic Russia in the USSR: The Dilemma of Dominance*. New York, Oxford, Toronto, Sydney, Frankfurt and Paris: Pergamon Press in cooperation with the Program on Soviet Nationality Problems, Columbia University, 1980. xxi, 346 pp.

BOROVYK, Mykhailo. *Ukrainsko-kanadiska presa ta ii znachennia dla ukraïnskoi menshyny v Kanadi*. Munich: Ukrainische Freie Universität, 1977. 344 pp.

The Crime of Moscow in Vinnytsia, 2d printing. Torrance, Cal.: Institute for Historical Review, n.d. 48 pp.

DOMBROVSKY, Oleksander. *Narys istorii ukrainskoho ievanhelsko-reformovanoho rukhu*. New York and Toronto: Ukrainian Evangelical Alliance of North America, 1979. 622 pp.

DUSHNYCK, Walter, ed. *Ukraine in a Changing World*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 1977. iii, 291 pp.

EDELMAN, Robert. *Gentry Politics on the Eve of the Russian Revolution: The Nationalist Party 1907-1917*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1980. xvii, 252 pp.

Eucharisterion: Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak on His Sixtieth Birthday by His Colleagues and Students. Ed. Ihor Ševceňko and Frank Sysyn with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasicnyk. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3-4 (1979-80), 2 parts. xiv, 958 pp.

FORDENKO, I. *Vid Stalina do Dazhboha*. Chicago: the author, 1980. 164 pp.

HENCKE, Andor. *Erinnerungen als Deutscher Konsul in Kiew in den Jahren 1933-1936*. Foreword by Georg Stadtmüller. Munich: Ukrainische Freie Universität, 1979. 72 pp.

KACZUROWSKY, Igor. *Because Deserters Are Immortal*. Trans. Yuri Tkach. Doncaster, Australia: Bayda Books, 1979. 141 pp.

KAMINSKY, Anatol. *Iaka oriientatsiia?* N.p.: Suchasnist, 1981. 92 pp.

KOPELEV, Lev. *The Education of a True Believer*. Trans. Gary Kern. New York: Harper & Row, 1980. xvi, 328 pp.

LUCIUK, Lubomyr Y. *Ukrainians in the Making: Their Kingston Story*. Kingston, Ont.: Limestone Press, 1980. x, 156 pp.

PINTNER, Walter McKenzie and Don Karl ROWNEY, eds. *Russian Officialdom: The Bureaucratization of Russian Society from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980. xvii, 396 pp.

PLIUSHCH, Leonid. *U karnavalni istorii*. With a contribution by Tatiana Zhitnikova-Pliushch. Ed., trans., with an intro. by Marco Carynnik. N.p.: Suchasnist, 1980. 371 pp.

Pohrom v Ukraini 1972-1979. Ed., annot., with an intro. by Roman Kupchinsky. N.p.: Suchasnist, 1980. 312 pp.

Propamiatna knyha dantsigeriv : Istorychni narysy ta spomyny kolyshnikh studentiv Politekhniky Vilnoho Mista Dantsigu 1921-1945. Ed. Volodymyr Shyprykevych. Philadelphia, Toronto and New York: Arkhivna komisiia dantsigeriv, 1979. 218 pp.

SOKOLENKO, Heras. *Tvory poeta nevidomoi doli*. Ed. L. Poltava. New York and Philadelphia: ADUK-OOChSU, 1981. 36 pp.

STRUMINSKYJ, Bohdan, comp. *Old Ruthenian Printed Books and Manuscripts in the Episcopal and Heritage Institute Libraries of the Byzantine Catholic Diocese of Passaic*. [Passaic, N.J.: Byzantine Catholic Diocese, 1980.] 21 pp.

Ukrainski poselennia : Dovidnyk. Ed. Atanas M. Miliianych, Volodymyr N. Bandera, Ihor M. Huryn and Wsevolod V. Isajiw. New York: Ukrainian Center for Social Research Inc., 1980. *Zapysky NTSh*, vol. 200. 351 pp.

Vasyl Romaniuk, A Voice in the Wilderness : Letters, Appeals, Essays. Trans. and ed. Jurij Dobczansky. Wheaton, Ill.: Society for the Study of Religion under Communism, 1980. 126 pp.

Zupynit kryvosuddia! Sprava Levka Lukianenka. Ed., annot., with an intro. by Stepan Sadovsky. N.p.: Suchasnist, 1980. 264 pp.

Journal

PUBLICATIONS OF THE CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Available from University of Toronto Press

Lektsii z istorii ukrainskoi literatury, 1798-1870

Lectures on the History of Ukrainian Literature, 1798-1870)
by Mykola Zerov

Edited by Doreen W. Gorsline and Oksana Solovey

Mykola Zerov, the gifted Ukrainian poet, translator, and critic, may also be considered as a founder of modern Ukrainian literary scholarship. His arrest in 1935 and subsequent death in a Soviet labour camp prevented him from completing the work he had begun with *Nove ukraïnske pysmenstvo* (*New Ukrainian Writing*, 1924), but this gap is filled in large measure by the lectures he delivered at Kiev University in 1928. Published from a typescript compiled by Zerov's students and checked by Zerov himself, the lectures deal with the crucial period of nineteenth-century Ukrainian literary history and are a model of scholarly objectivity.

271 pages cloth \$9.95 paper \$3.95

Vaplitianskyi zbirnyk

The Vaplite Collection

Edited by George Luckyj

The writers and artists who grouped together in VAPLITE (1925-1928) spearheaded the cultural revival in Ukraine in the 1920s. Their attempt to develop a high culture, based on Western European models, was cut short by the onset of Stalinism. The group was disbanded under official pressure, and many of its members were subjected to severe repressions. George Luckyj, who is also the author of *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934*, has assembled a rich collection of letters, diaries, poetry, and fiction from the archives of VAPLITE. Unavailable elsewhere for the most part, the texts are enhanced by forty-three rare illustrations.

260 pages cloth \$10.95 paper \$4.95

Antolohiia ukrainskoi liryky, chastyna I — do 1919

An Anthology of Ukrainian Lyric Poetry, Part I — To 1919

Edited by Orest Zilynsky

"A favorite scholarly idea of Zilynsky's was that the Ukrainian *Geist* attained its greatest heights in lyrical poetry," wrote *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* in June 1977. This idea has found its full expression in the present anthology, which provides a rich sampling of Ukrainian lyric poetry, from anonymous seventeenth-century songs to twentieth-century Symbolist poetry. The volume contains a long introduction by the editor, whose untimely death in 1976 deprived Ukrainian scholarship of a leading light, a biographical note by Eva Biss-Zilynska, a survey of Zilynsky's scholarly work by Mykola Mushynka, and notes on the authors and sources.

439 pages cloth \$13.95 paper \$6.95

Ukrainian for Undergraduates
by Danylo Husar Struk

Intended for university students with some background in the language, *Ukrainian for Undergraduates* introduces basic morphology and vocabulary through numerous drills, written and oral exercises, and tables. Points of grammar are explained in English, but grammatical terminology is given in both Ukrainian and English.

350 pages cloth \$9.00 paper \$5.00

Ukrainian Dumy

Editio minor

Introduction by N. K. Moyle

Translated by George Tarnawsky and Patricia Kilina

The *dumy*—lyrical epics based on sixteenth and seventeenth-century historical events and performed by wandering minstrels to a musical accompaniment—are widely regarded as an especially important achievement of Ukrainian oral literature. They are presented here in a college edition with originals and translations *en face* by the poets George Tarnawsky and Patricia Kilina. The complete academic edition of the *dumy* will be published by the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. Published for the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

219 pages cloth \$9.95 paper \$5.95

NEW BOOKS

Modern Ukrainian
by Assya Humesky

Used as a first-year university grammar at Harvard University for several years in manuscript form, *Modern Ukrainian* presents the fundamental morphology and vocabulary of Ukrainian and some notations on syntax and intonation through the use of exercises and dialogues. Notes explain grammar rules, usage, stylistic flavour, and regional variants. n.

438 pages paper \$8.00

Journal

Changing Realities: Social Trends among Ukrainian Canadians Edited by W. Roman Petryshyn

Selected papers from a conference sponsored by the Institute and held at the University of Ottawa in September 1978. There is an introduction by the editor and summary comments by Dr. Charles Keely of the prestigious Population Council in New York. The volume includes economic studies by W. Darcovich, W. Isajiw; sociological studies by L. Driedger, W. Kalbach and M. Richard, O. Kuprowska, M. Petryshyn, O. Wolowyna; demographic studies by J. Kralt, J. Wolowyna; and political studies by R. March, I. Myhul, and M. Isaacs. The contributors include both established and up-and-coming scholars drawn from across Canada.

Changing Realities interprets the social statistics on assimilatory processes affecting Ukrainian community maintenance and development. It enables Ukrainian Canadians to reflect more deeply on and plan for their future. This volume joins other Institute publications in critically assessing the current situation of Ukrainians and their future prospects in a multicultural Canada.

xvii, 249 pages paper \$7.95

Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present Edited by Peter J. Potichnyj

Long, intimate and frequently acrimonious, relations between Poland and Ukraine have had a crucial impact on the course of East European history. To discuss this legacy, a conference on Poland and Ukraine was held in October 1977 at McMaster University. The Ukrainian and Polish scholars who assembled at the conference treated such themes as the historical background of the two countries, cultural relations, economic ties and communications, and present-day political problems. These papers constitute essential reading for an understanding of both countries. Among the contributors are: A. Bromke, A. Kaminski, J. Pelenski, I. L. Rudnytsky, H. Seton-Watson, O. Subtelny, F. Sysyn and R. Szporluk.

xiv, 365 pages cloth \$14.95 paper \$9.95

The Sovietization of Ukraine 1917-1923: The Communist Doctrine and Practice of National Self-Determination
by Jurij Borys

Sovietization of Ukraine lays bare the Bolsheviks' theory and practice of national self-determination with regard to Ukraine from the outbreak of the revolution in 1917 to the creation of the Soviet Union in 1923. In addition to presenting a detailed account of the events leading to Ukraine's sovietization, Dr. Borys analyses Marxist theory on the national question as well as the socio-economic and political situation in Ukraine on the eve of and during the revolution.

In a foreword to *Sovietization of Ukraine*, John A. Armstrong writes: "One of the great achievements of Jurij Borys' book is to have recognized the significance of the complex relationship between Bolshevism and nationalism in the critical Ukrainian arena. The heart of his treatment is comprehensive and original Borys was years ahead of most political scientists and historians working on Soviet subjects in general, to say nothing of those analysing specific national problems."

Sovietization of Ukraine originally appeared in Stockholm in 1960 as *The Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine: A Study in the Communist Doctrine of the Self-Determination of Nations*. The second edition has been revised and illustrations have been added.

xxii, 488 pages cloth \$19.95 paper \$12.95

Shevchenko and the Critics, 1861-1980

Edited by George Luckyj, introduction by Bohdan Rubchak

A series of critical essays dating from the time of Shevchenko's death up to the present, illuminating various aspects of the poet's life and work. Contributors, in chronological order, are: P. Kulish, M. Drahomanov, V. Antonovych, I. Franko, B. Hrinchenko, M. Ievshan, K. Chukovsky, A. Richytsky, P. Fylypovych, M. Mohylansky, S. Iefremov, M. Draikhmara, S. Smal-Stotsky, D. Chyzhevsky, M. Hudzii, M. Rylsky, V. Sloboda, G. Shevelov, V. Miiakovsky, G. Luckyj, B. Rubchak, L. Schneider, L. Pliushch and G. Grabowicz.

Published in association with the CIUS by the University of Toronto Press.

522 pages cloth \$30.00 paper \$8.50

JUST PUBLISHED

Recollections about the Life of the First Ukrainian Settlers in Canada

by William A. Czumer

A translation of a work first published in Ukrainian by William (Vasyl) Czumer in Edmonton in 1942. A pioneer schoolteacher, Czumer compiled a fascinating collection of early memoirs about the experiences of Ukrainian settlers in Western Canada. The book was translated by Louis T. Laychuk and contains an introduction by Manoly R. Lupul.

xiii, 176 pages cloth \$9.95 paper \$5.95

Ukrainian-English Dictionary, 2d Printing

Edited by C. H. Andrusyshen

The publication of this comprehensive dictionary twenty-five years ago was an important event in Ukrainian-Canadian scholarship. This new paperback printing will serve thousands of students well, just as the original did.

xxix, 1163 pp. paper \$19.95

Available from Ukrainian Academic Press

Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors

By Mykhailo Kotsiubynsky. Translated by Marco Carynnik, with notes and a definitive essay by Bohdan Rubchak.

A masterpiece of Ukrainian literature by a leading Modernist writer whose works—rooted in Ukrainian life—explore the human psyche. Kotsiubynsky's fascination with the Hutsuls of the Carpathian Mountains, their customs and beliefs, finds expression in this colorful work.

127 pp. cloth U.S.\$14.50 paper U.S.\$9.50

*Ukrainian Academic Press
P.O. Box 263
Littleton, CO 80160, USA*

*University of Toronto Press
5201 Dufferin Street
Downsview, Ontario
Canada, M3H 5T8*

Available from University of Alberta Press

Ukrainian Canadians: A Survey of Their Portrayal in English-Language Works

By Frances Swyripa

Frances Swyripa, a research assistant in the CIUS at the University of Alberta, has provided an important guide to the state of Ukrainian-Canadian studies. Her survey highlights the changing place of Ukrainians in Canada by taking a chronological look at government reports, theses, novels, magazine articles, and writings by educators and churchmen to show changes in the image of Ukrainians. The book concludes with a bibliography of sources, biographical sketches, and a note on existing Ukrainian-Canadian bibliographies.

169 pages cloth \$9.95 paper \$3.95

**Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism:
An Assessment**

Edited by Manoly R. Lupul

The conference proceedings in this volume record the discussion of relationships between multiculturalism and separatism—issues crucial to all Canadians. They illustrate that Ukrainians have a large contribution to make in the current national unity debate. The contents also critically examine the implications of multiculturalism, federalism, and separatism for Canada as a whole and for one of Canada's largest ethnocultural groups—the Ukrainians—in all regions of Canada. Proposals put forth illustrate that it is both possible and vital that the development of Canadians of all backgrounds be encouraged and helped to achieve a sense of national unity which encompasses all Canadians.

177 pages paper \$4.95

*The University of Alberta Press
450 Athabasca Hall
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada, T6G 2E8*

Journal

Available from *Carl Winter Universitätsverlag*

A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language

By George Shevelov

Covering the entire history of Ukrainian in its phonological aspects from the inception of the language in Common Slavic to the present, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* examines Standard Ukrainian against the background of, and in relation to, its dialects. All phonetic changes are discussed, including accentological ones and those interacting with morphology. Diagrams, charts, and maps supplement the text, and each chapter is followed by an extensive selective bibliography. The book constitutes a part of *The Historical Phonology of the Slavic Languages*, a series edited by Professor Shevelov, who is also the author of such distinguished studies as *The Syntax of Modern Literary Ukrainian* (1963) and *A Prehistory of Slavic* (1964).

Published for the CIUS by Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

vi, 809 pages cloth 500Dm paper 460Dm

Available from:

Carl Winter Universitätsverlag
Postfach 10 61 40
6900 Heidelberg 1
West Germany

TO THOSE WISHING TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

All submissions must be typed on 8½ x 11 inch paper and double-spaced throughout. Footnotes should be placed at the end of the manuscript. Block quotations and four or more lines of verse from Ukrainian should appear in the original. Otherwise the modified Library of Congress system of cyrillic transliteration should be used.

In general, articles should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages, except where especially justified by extensive documentation, tables, or charts. For purposes of style and footnoting, the University of Chicago Press *Manual of Style* should be consulted. Authors should send a short academic biography with their submissions. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and postage provided. The policy of the *Journal* is not to consider articles that have been published or are being considered for publication elsewhere. The editors reserve the right to edit all submissions.

A TABLE OF TRANSLITERATION

(Modified Library of Congress)

а	—	а	ї	—	і	ф	—	ф
б	—	б	ў	—	і	х	—	kh
в	—	в	к	—	к	ц	—	ts
г	—	h	л	—	l	ч	—	ch
ѓ	—	g	м	—	m	ш	—	sh
đ	—	d	н	—	n	щ	—	shch
е	—	e	օ	—	օ	յօ	—	iu
€	—	ie	պ	—	p	յ	—	ia
ж	—	zh	ր	—	r	ь	—	-
з	—	z	ս	—	s	-иї	—	y in endings
и	—	y	տ	—	t			of personal
і	—	i	յ	—	u			names only

